Preface: Expanded Core Framework Series..... 7
Mexico: Three Centuries of Revolutionary Rhetoric and Elite Continuity..... 8
Part 1 of 5: Spanish Colonial Foundations and the Hacienda System (1521-1810).....8
I. Conquest and the Foundation of Appropriation (1519-1570)..... 9
II. The Hacienda System Emerges (1570-1700)..... 12
III. Late Colonial Consolidation (1700-1810)..... 16
Conclusion: The Colonial Template That Would Persist.....18
Mexico: Three Centuries of Revolutionary Rhetoric and Elite Continuity..... 21
Part 2 of 5: Independence Through Porfiriato - Elite Transitions Without Redistribution (1810-1910)..... 21
I. Independence and the First Elite Transition (1810-1821).....22
II. Liberal Reform: "Modernization" Accelerating Dispossession (1855-1876)..... 25
III. The Porfiriato: Peak Oligarchic Concentration (1876-1910).....28
Conclusion: Colonial Template Survived Three Transformations..... 34
Mexico: Three Centuries of Revolutionary Rhetoric and Elite Continuity..... 36
Part 3 of 5: The Mexican Revolution - Genuine Redistribution That Was Reversed (1910-1940)..... 36
I. The Revolutionary Explosion (1910-1920)..... 37
II. The Revolutionary Settlement and Limited Redistribution (1917-1934)..... 40
III. Cárdenas and Peak Redistribution (1934-1940)..... 42
Conclusion: Revolutionary Success and Built-In Limits.....46
Mexico: Three Centuries of Revolutionary Rhetoric and Elite Continuity..... 49
Part 4 of 5: The PRI System and Neoliberal Counter-Revolution (1940-2018)..... 49
I. PRI Management: Undermining Ejidos While Maintaining Control (1940-1982).....50
II. The Salinas Counter-Revolution: Legalizing Reconcentration (1988-1994).....54
III. The Reconcentration Accelerates (1994-2018).....57
Conclusion: The 75-Year Reversal..... 59
Mexico: Three Centuries of Revolutionary Rhetoric and Elite Continuity..... 62
Part 5 of 5: Contemporary Mexico and the Pattern Synthesized (2000-2025)..... 62
I. The Democratic Transition: PAN Governments (2000-2012)..... 63
II. PRI Return: Peña Nieto (2012-2018).....65
III. MORENA and the "Fourth Transformation" (2018-2025)..... 67
IV. Elite Family Continuity: 200-500 Years of Wealth Transmission..... 71
V. Why 500 Years of "Revolutions" Failed..... 75
VI. Contemporary Property Concentration Statistics (2020-2025).....78
VII. The Synthesis: What Mexico Teaches..... 80
VIII. Final Synthesis: 500 Years, Zero Permanent Change..... 84
Conclusion: The Mexican Pattern and Global Implications..... 88

MEXICO CASE STUDY: THEMATIC BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 90
"Three Centuries of Revolutionary Rhetoric and Elite Continuity (1521-2025)"..... 90
I. COLONIAL FOUNDATIONS AND PROPERTY APPROPRIATION (1519-1810)..... 90
II. INDEPENDENCE AND LIBERAL REFORM (1810-1876).....91
III. PORFIRIATO AND EXTREME CONCENTRATION (1876-1910)..... 92
IV. MEXICAN REVOLUTION AND LAND REFORM (1910-1940).....93
V. PRI ERA AND EJIDO SYSTEM (1940-1982).....94
VI. NEOLIBERAL ERA AND RECONCENTRATION (1982-2000)..... 95
VII. DEMOCRATIC TRANSITION ERA (2000-2018).....97
VIII. MORENA ERA AND FOURTH TRANSFORMATION (2018-2025).....98
IX. ELITE FAMILIES AND WEALTH CONCENTRATION.....99
X. STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS.....100
XI. COMPARATIVE LATIN AMERICAN CONTEXT.....101
XII. PRIMARY SOURCES AND STATISTICAL DATA..... 102
XIII. THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO COLLECTION FRAMEWORK.....102
METHODOLOGICAL NOTE.....103

Preface: Expanded Core Framework Series

This is a new series using an **Expanded Core Framework** that evolved from the original **Core Framework** .

This expanded analysis was created through continued collaboration between Thomas J. Bryan and Claude (Anthropic's AI system). The collaboration improved both the methodology and the conclusions.

Human Contribution (Thomas J. Bryan):

- Research direction and case study selection
- Theoretical framework and interpretation
- Final analytical judgments and publication decisions

AI Contribution (Claude/Anthropic):

- Historical scholarship synthesis and bibliographic research
- Essay composition and structural analysis
- Intellectual challenge and critical questioning
- Pattern identification and comparative analysis

Thomas J. Bryan
October 2025
Published on Archive.org

Original preface ("An Unexpected Journey") published separately provides full context for how this research project developed.

Mexico: Three Centuries of Revolutionary Rhetoric and Elite Continuity

Part 1 of 5: Spanish Colonial Foundations and the Hacienda System (1521-1810)

Introduction: The Template of Dispossession

When Hernán Cortés entered Tenochtitlan in November 1519, he encountered a city larger and more sophisticated than any in Spain. The Aztec capital held 200,000-300,000 inhabitants with advanced infrastructure, markets, temples, and administrative systems. The Aztec Empire controlled perhaps 25 million people across central Mexico through sophisticated tribute networks. The indigenous civilization Cortés encountered possessed accumulated wealth, complex social organization, and productive agricultural systems that had sustained large populations for centuries.

Thirty years later, the indigenous population had collapsed to perhaps 6 million—a 75% decline from disease, violence, and forced labor. By 1605, barely 1 million indigenous people remained—a 96% population catastrophe that enabled the most complete property appropriation in human history. The lands that had sustained 25 million indigenous peoples now belonged to approximately 5,000-10,000 Spanish colonists and their Creole descendants. The hacienda system emerged from this genocide—vast estates built on indigenous dispossession, maintained through legal frameworks declaring indigenous property rights nonexistent, enforced through violence eliminating resistance.

This colonial template would prove remarkably resilient. Mexican independence would transfer sovereignty from Spanish crown to Creole elite without redistributing property. Liberal reforms would accelerate concentration by destroying remaining indigenous communal lands. The Porfiriato would reach peak oligarchic concentration with 97% landless by 1910. Even the Mexican Revolution—the only successful Latin American land reform—would see its redistributions systematically reversed through legal "reform" and market mechanisms. By 2025, property concentration approaches Porfirian levels again, often controlled by families whose wealth traces to colonial origins or revolutionary era consolidation.

Understanding why three "revolutions" (independence, liberal reform, Mexican Revolution) failed to permanently redistribute property requires understanding the colonial foundations: how Spanish law denied indigenous property rights, how the hacienda system subordinated labor through debt peonage, how racial caste hierarchies fragmented resistance, and how property concentration became naturalized as legitimate ownership despite origins in genocide and theft.

The Spanish colonial period didn't just establish Mexican territorial boundaries. It established the elite power structure that would survive independence, reform, revolution, and democratic transition—demonstrating that property concentration rooted in historical appropriation persists across political transformations when legal frameworks protect it and elite networks coordinate to defend it.

I. Conquest and the Foundation of Appropriation (1519-1570)

The Demographic Catastrophe Enabling Dispossession

The Spanish conquest succeeded militarily through technological advantages, indigenous allies (Tlaxcalans opposing Aztec dominance), and strategic exploitation of political divisions. But the transformation of land ownership from indigenous to Spanish control required demographic collapse of unprecedented scale. The numbers document catastrophe:

Population estimates:

- 1519: 20-25 million indigenous people in central Mexico
- 1548: 6-8 million (70-75% decline in 30 years)
- 1568: 3-4 million (84-85% decline in 50 years)
- 1595: 2 million (92% decline)
- 1605: 1-1.5 million (94-96% decline)

The primary cause was disease—smallpox, measles, typhus—to which indigenous populations had no immunity. But Spanish policies accelerated death: forced labor in mines killing tens of thousands, destruction of indigenous agricultural systems creating famine, warfare eliminating resistance, and deliberate violence against communities refusing submission. Whether intentional genocide or "merely" demographic catastrophe from colonial policies, the result was identical: near-complete elimination of indigenous population enabling total property appropriation.

The mechanism was systematic: Indigenous communities that had cultivated lands for centuries suddenly lost 90-95% of population through epidemic waves (1520s, 1540s, 1570s, 1590s). The survivors lacked numbers to defend territories, maintain agricultural production, or resist Spanish appropriation. Spanish authorities declared depopulated lands "vacant" (baldíos) despite indigenous survivors' claims. The legal fiction that indigenous peoples had abandoned land enabled Spanish grants without acknowledging theft.

The Encomienda System: Disguised Slavery

Cortés distributed encomiendas to conquistadors immediately after conquest. The encomienda granted Spanish colonists rights to indigenous labor and tribute from specified communities. Legally, the land remained crown property and indigenous peoples remained "free"—but Spanish encomenderos controlled indigenous labor, extracted tribute, and exercised near-absolute authority over assigned populations.

How it operated: An encomendero received grant of indigenous community—perhaps 500-2,000 people. Those indigenous peoples owed tribute (goods, labor, or currency) to the encomendero. They were legally "free" subjects of Spanish crown but could not refuse encomendero demands. Refusal meant violence. Flight meant pursuit and punishment. The encomienda created subordination comparable to slavery while maintaining legal fiction of freedom.

The scale of grants: Cortés reserved the richest encomiendas for himself—controlling perhaps 100,000-150,000 indigenous people across multiple regions. His allies received grants of 1,000-20,000 people. By 1550, approximately 500 encomenderos controlled majority of indigenous population in central Mexico. These 500 men and their descendants would form core of colonial elite whose property and power would persist for centuries.

The transition from labor to land: Initially, encomenderos wanted indigenous labor—mining silver, building estates, producing agricultural goods. But as indigenous population collapsed, labor value declined. Simultaneously, Spanish law (New Laws 1542) attempted restricting encomienda abuses by limiting labor extraction. The encomendero response was converting labor rights into land claims. If indigenous communities declined to 10% of original population, encomenderos claimed the "abandoned" 90% of land. Legal mechanisms enabled this transformation from labor control to land ownership.

Silver and the Extraction Economy

The discovery of massive silver deposits—Zacatecas (1546), Guanajuato (1550s), Potosí in Peru (1545)—transformed New Spain into extraction colony generating enormous wealth flowing to Spanish elite. Silver mining required labor, capital, and transportation infrastructure that concentrated power in elite hands.

The numbers reveal scale: New Spain silver production reached 150,000-250,000 kilograms annually by 1590s. Value exceeded 5-8 million pesos annually. This represented perhaps 30-40% of global silver production in late 16th century. The wealth generated exceeded total Spanish crown revenues from all other sources. Mexico became vital to Spanish imperial finances and global silver supply feeding European and Asian trade.

Who captured this wealth? Mine owners (often encomenderos diversifying assets), merchants financing mining operations, royal officials collecting 20% (quinto real) as crown share, and Spanish crown extracting additional revenues through taxation and monopoly controls. The indigenous peoples providing forced labor in mines received minimal or no compensation while dying in enormous numbers from accidents, overwork, and mercury poisoning.

Labor procurement for mines: The mita (forced labor draft) required indigenous communities to provide workers for specified periods. Despite legal limitations on hours and conditions, mine work was death sentence—perhaps 30-50% of drafted workers died during service. The demographic catastrophe accelerated in mining regions as forced labor killed indigenous peoples faster than disease alone would have.

The property pattern: Silver wealth enabled mine owners to purchase land, establish haciendas, and diversify holdings. The most successful became colonial elite combining mining, agriculture, and commerce. Their descendants would dominate New Spain for three centuries and survive independence as Mexican oligarchy.

Legal Frameworks Denying Indigenous Property Rights

Spanish colonial law created sophisticated framework declaring indigenous property rights inferior or nonexistent while establishing Spanish/Creole property as absolute:

The legal fictions:

Conquest rights: Spanish crown claimed sovereignty over Americas through papal bulls and "right of discovery"—legal doctrines denying indigenous sovereignty existed. If indigenous peoples had no sovereignty, they had no property rights enforceable against Spanish claims.

Vacant lands (baldíos): Any land not actively cultivated or inhabited could be declared vacant royal property available for Spanish grants. This ignored indigenous practices of rotating cultivation, seasonal use, hunting territories, and communal holdings. Spanish definitions of "productive use" excluded indigenous land management—enabling appropriation of 80-90% of territories.

Pueblo/village lands: Spanish law recognized limited indigenous communal holdings around villages—typically 600 varas (approximately 500 meters) radius. Everything beyond this tiny area could be appropriated. Indigenous territories that had sustained millions were reduced to small plots around village centers.

Individual vs. communal ownership: Spanish law privileged individual title over communal holdings. Indigenous communities traditionally held land communally with family use rights. Spanish law declared communal holdings inferior to individual ownership—enabling Spanish buyers to claim land indigenous communities couldn't "prove" individual ownership of.

The legal procedures enabling appropriation:

Composición (legalization): Spanish colonists who had occupied land without formal title could "compose" (legitimize) their holdings through nominal payments to crown. This transformed illegal squatting into legal ownership. Between 1591-1620, perhaps 5-10 million hectares were "composed"—legalizing theft through administrative process.

Merced (land grant): Spanish authorities granted land to colonists for services to crown or settlement purposes. These grants often overlapped indigenous holdings. When disputes arose, Spanish courts sided with Spanish claimants. Indigenous peoples lacking Spanish legal representation lost repeatedly.

Purchase from crown: Financially-pressed crown sold "vacant" lands to raise revenues. The buyers were Spanish/Creole elite with capital. Indigenous communities couldn't compete financially for lands they had occupied for centuries. Market mechanisms transferred property from indigenous collective ownership to Spanish individual ownership.

The result by 1600: Perhaps 85-90% of indigenous land had been appropriated through these legal mechanisms. The remaining 10-15% consisted of small pueblo grants and marginal lands Spanish hadn't yet claimed. This appropriation was legal under Spanish law—transforming genocide and theft into legitimate property ownership that would be protected by Mexican law after independence.

II. The Hacienda System Emerges (1570-1700)

From Encomienda to Hacienda: Permanent Property Control

As Spanish crown restricted encomienda labor rights through New Laws (1542) and later reforms, the colonial elite transformed their power from labor control to land ownership. The hacienda (large agricultural estate) replaced encomienda as foundation of elite wealth. This transition was deliberate and systematic:

The mechanism: Encomenderos used their labor rights to build agricultural operations on land they appropriated. They constructed buildings, established production, and created improvements that Spanish law recognized as property-generating. When crown ended hereditary encomienda rights (gradually 1550s-1720s), former encomenderos claimed ownership of land their encomiendas had occupied—arguing their investments created property rights. Spanish courts accepted these claims.

Land accumulation strategies: Elite families acquired hacienda properties through multiple mechanisms: encomienda conversion as described above, purchase of "vacant" lands from crown at nominal prices, purchase of indigenous pueblo lands (legal after 1591 composiciones), marriage alliances consolidating holdings between elite families, and gradual expansion appropriating adjacent lands.

The scale of haciendas: By 1650-1700, individual haciendas reached 10,000-100,000 hectares. The largest estates exceeded 200,000 hectares. A 1644 survey found that 60 haciendas controlled 3.8 million hectares in Bajío region—averaging 63,000 hectares each. These were not farms—these were territories larger than many European principalities.

Debt Peonage: The Labor System After Demographic Collapse

The indigenous population collapse created labor shortage for hacienda operations. Spanish solution was debt peonage—system creating legally "free" workers who were functionally enslaved through debt mechanisms:

How debt peonage operated:

Initial recruitment: Hacienda would offer indigenous worker advance payment (30-50 pesos) for agreeing to work. This advance created debt. Worker signed contract specifying labor obligations and debt repayment terms.

The trap: Wages were set at levels insufficient to repay debt plus living costs. Hacienda operated company store (tienda de raya) charging inflated prices for necessities—perhaps 200-300% markup over market rates. Worker's wages went to debt payments and store purchases, creating perpetual indebtedness.

Legal enforcement: Spanish law treated debt as binding obligation. Workers couldn't leave employment while indebted. Flight constituted theft (of advance payment) punishable by imprisonment or return to employer. Hacienda owners could sell worker debts—transferring workers between estates like property.

Intergenerational transmission: Children inherited parents' debts. A worker born into debt peonage would die in debt peonage, as would his children. The system created hereditary subordination comparable to slavery without formal slave status.

The numbers: By 1700, perhaps 60-70% of indigenous rural population lived under debt peonage. Debts averaged 30-80 pesos—representing 6-12 months wages. The perpetual nature of debts meant workers could never accumulate capital, acquire property, or escape hacienda control.

Violence maintaining the system: Hacienda owners employed overseers enforcing discipline through whipping, imprisonment in estate jails, and occasionally killing workers as examples. Spanish colonial law gave hacienda owners wide discretion in "disciplining" workers—effectively providing legal immunity for violence.

The Seventeen Families Thesis: Elite Concentration

Historical analysis suggests that by 1700, approximately 15-20 extended families controlled majority of valuable land in central Mexico. These families were interconnected through marriage, business partnerships, and shared interests in maintaining property concentration:

Examples of elite families:

The Cortés family (Marquesado del Valle): Hernán Cortés received vast encomiendas and land grants for conquering Mexico. His descendants maintained estates exceeding 200,000

hectares across Oaxaca and Morelos until 20th century. The family diversified into sugar production, mining, and commerce—creating integrated wealth empire.

The Rincón Gallardo family: Established haciendas in Aguascalientes and surrounding regions during late 1500s-early 1600s. By 1700, controlled approximately 150,000-200,000 hectares. Family maintained land ownership through multiple regime changes—still among Mexico's largest landowners in 1900s.

The Sánchez de Tagle family: Accumulated properties around Mexico City and north toward mining regions. Combined agricultural production supplying Mexico City with trade, credit operations, and mining investments. Multi-generational wealth through 1800s.

The pattern across elite families:

- Initial wealth from conquest participation or early colonial service
- Conversion of encomienda rights to land ownership
- Strategic marriages consolidating properties
- Diversification into mining, commerce, credit
- Political positions reinforcing economic power
- Intergenerational transmission through inheritance law protecting primogeniture

The concentration statistics: While exact numbers are debated, credible estimates suggest 5-10% of population controlled 80-90% of agricultural land by 1700. Within that 5-10%, the top 15-20 families controlled perhaps 40-50% of total wealth. This concentration exceeded European patterns—creating oligarchy comparable to feudal aristocracy but with more complete dominance.

The Church as Massive Landowner

The Catholic Church accumulated perhaps 40-50% of valuable agricultural land in New Spain by 1800 through mechanisms that paralleled but exceeded elite family accumulation:

Acquisition mechanisms:

Pious donations: Spanish and Creole elite donated land to church for salvation of souls, endowment of masses, establishment of chaplaincies, and charitable institutions. These donations were perpetual—land couldn't be sold or reverted. Over 250 years, donations accumulated massively.

Mortmain (dead hand): Church properties weren't subject to inheritance division or forced sales. While elite families sometimes fragmented holdings across heirs, church lands consolidated continuously. This created permanent institutional wealth unmatched by any individual family.

Mortgage lending: Church religious orders (Jesuits, Augustinians, etc.) provided mortgage loans to hacienda owners at 5-6% annual interest. When borrowers defaulted (common during

economic downturns), church foreclosed and acquired properties. This mechanism transferred land from indebted families to church institutions.

Tithe revenues: Church collected 10% of agricultural production as tithe. These revenues financed land purchases, building construction, and further accumulation. The tithe functioned as wealth extraction mechanism transferring resources from producers to church institutions.

The scale of church landholding: By 1800, estimates suggest church institutions owned or controlled: 40-50% of urban real estate in major cities like Mexico City, Puebla, and Guadalajara, 30-40% of rural agricultural land in wealthy regions, mortgage liens on additional 20-30% of hacienda properties, and liquid capital exceeding most elite families.

The church-elite relationship: Church land concentration didn't oppose elite secular interests—it complemented them. Elite families placed younger sons in high church positions (bishops, cathedral chapters, religious order leadership). Church supported property law protecting all ownership. Church ideology justified inequality as divinely ordained. The alliance between church institutions and secular elite maintained property concentration jointly.

Indigenous Communities: Pueblos Reduced to Poverty

The minority of indigenous peoples surviving demographic catastrophe retained small communal holdings (pueblos) but faced continuous pressure reducing their land:

Legal restrictions on pueblos: Spanish law recognized pueblo lands but within strict limits—600 varas radius around village center, additional ejido (communal pasture) if granted, and fundo legal (village building zone). Total pueblo holdings might be 500-2,000 hectares for communities of 500-1,500 people—barely sufficient for subsistence.

Appropriation mechanisms: Haciendas expanded into pueblo lands through legal purchases (Spanish law permitted sale after 1591), rental arrangements that became permanent occupations, encroachment claiming pueblo lands were "vacant", and pressuring pueblos to sell during famines or epidemics when communities desperately needed cash.

The numbers: Between 1570-1700, perhaps 40-50% of remaining pueblo lands were lost to hacienda expansion. Communities that had held 5,000-10,000 hectares before conquest retained 500-1,000 hectares by 1700—reduction of 90-95%. The surviving pueblo lands were often marginal—hillsides, poor soil, inadequate water—while haciendas controlled prime agricultural land.

Pueblo poverty and subordination: Indigenous communities on pueblo lands couldn't sustain populations from small holdings. Men worked as laborers on neighboring haciendas—often under debt peonage. Women and children maintained subsistence agriculture on pueblo plots. The system created permanent poverty ensuring indigenous peoples would remain subordinated labor force for hacienda economy.

Resistance and suppression: Indigenous communities resisted through legal appeals to Spanish courts, occasional revolts, and maintaining traditional governance within pueblos. Spanish response combined limited legal protections (maintaining pueblos as labor reserve) with violent suppression of resistance. When pueblos revolted, Spanish military destroyed villages, killed leaders, and appropriated additional lands as punishment.

III. Late Colonial Consolidation (1700-1810)

Bourbon Reforms and Elite Adaptation

The Bourbon dynasty's ascension in Spain (1700) brought administrative reforms attempting to increase crown revenues and reduce corruption. These reforms affected New Spain's elite but didn't redistribute property:

The fiscal reforms: Bourbons increased taxes, improved collection efficiency, reduced tax exemptions, created new monopolies (tobacco, mercury, playing cards), and restricted church economic privileges. Crown revenues from New Spain increased from 5-6 million pesos annually (1700) to 20-25 million (1800)—representing 400% increase.

Elite adaptation rather than confrontation: Mexican elite absorbed increased taxation while maintaining property and wealth. Higher taxes reduced profit margins but didn't threaten fundamental ownership. Elite demonstrated remarkable flexibility—accepting fiscal burden to preserve property protection. This calculation would repeat: elites accept flow costs (taxes, regulations) to maintain stock (property ownership).

The intendancy system (1780s): Bourbons reorganized colonial administration creating intendancies with professional administrators reducing corruption. This improved governance efficiency but didn't challenge property concentration. The new intendants came from Spanish/Creole elite or allied with them through marriage and business—ensuring reforms operated within elite interests.

The Royal Order on Consolidación (1804): Spain, desperate for war financing, ordered liquidation of church mortgage loans and transfer of funds to crown. This forced hacendados to repay church loans immediately—creating liquidity crisis. Many haciendas went to auction. But buyers were other elite families—property rotated among elite without democratizing ownership.

Creole vs. Peninsular Tensions Within Elite Unity

Late colonial period saw growing tensions between Creoles (American-born Spanish descendants) and Peninsulares (Spanish-born colonists). But both groups united absolutely on property protection:

The Creole grievances: Bourbon reforms privileged Peninsular appointments to high offices, monopoly contracts favored Peninsular merchants, tax revenues extracted to Spain rather than invested locally, and social prestige favored Spanish birth over Creole wealth. The wealthiest Creole families resented subordination to less wealthy Peninsulares.

The property consensus: Despite political tensions, Creoles and Peninsulares agreed completely on: property rights are absolute and permanent, indigenous peoples have no claims to ancestral lands, debt peonage is necessary labor system, pueblo lands can be appropriated when economically beneficial, and any redistribution threatens both Creole and Peninsular wealth.

The elite intermarriage: Despite status tensions, Creole and Peninsular families intermarried extensively. Wealthy Peninsular merchants married Creole heiresses (bringing Spanish commercial connections to Creole land wealth). Peninsular officials married into established Creole families (gaining local influence and property). These marriages created elite unity transcending birth origin.

The lesson for independence: When independence came (1810-1821), Creole elite would lead it—but as property owners united with conservative Peninsulares to prevent any redistribution threatening their estates. The independence "revolution" would transfer sovereignty while protecting property.

Property Concentration Statistics Pre-Independence

By 1800-1810, New Spain demonstrated extreme property concentration that would structure Mexican society for next two centuries:

Land ownership patterns: Approximately 5,000-10,000 elite families owned 80-90% of agricultural land. Perhaps 1,000-2,000 families controlled 60-70%. The church owned 40-50% of urban property and 30-40% of rural land. Indigenous pueblos retained 10-15% of territory—reduced to marginal lands. Approximately 60-70% of rural population lived under debt peonage with no property.

Hacienda sizes: The largest haciendas exceeded 500,000 hectares—the Sánchez Navarro family estates in Coahuila approached 800,000 hectares by 1810. Medium haciendas averaged 20,000-50,000 hectares. Even "small" Spanish holdings exceeded 5,000 hectares—compared to pueblo parcels of 2-5 hectares per family.

Wealth concentration: Estimates suggest top 5% of population controlled 85-90% of wealth. The wealthiest 500-1,000 families possessed fortunes of 100,000-500,000 pesos—while indigenous peasant families survived on 50-100 pesos annually. Wealth inequality exceeded anywhere in Europe.

Regional variations: Northern frontier regions (Coahuila, Chihuahua, Nuevo León) showed even greater concentration—single families controlled territories larger than European

principalities. Central Mexico (Bajío, Mexico City region) had somewhat more diverse ownership but still extreme concentration. Southern regions (Oaxaca, Chiapas) maintained more indigenous communal holdings but these were marginal lands.

The Racial Caste System: Fragmenting Resistance

Spanish colonial rule developed elaborate racial hierarchy fragmenting potential resistance through legal categories:

The sistema de castas: Spanish law defined 16-20 racial categories based on ancestry: Peninsulares (Spanish-born), Criollos (American-born Spanish), Mestizos (Spanish-indigenous), Mulatos (Spanish-African), Zambos (Indigenous-African), plus numerous subcategories. Each category had different legal rights, restrictions, and social status.

Legal discrimination by category: Peninsulares held highest positions and faced fewest restrictions. Criollos could own property but faced office restrictions. Mestizos faced occupational limits but could own small properties. Indigenous peoples paid tribute and faced forced labor. Africans (enslaved and free) faced maximum restrictions. Each category had slight advantages over those below—creating incentives for fragmentation rather than unity.

Property access by race: Spanish law restricted property ownership by racial category. Full property rights required Spanish ancestry (Peninsular or Criollo). Mestizos could own small holdings with restrictions. Indigenous peoples theoretically could own pueblo lands but couldn't sell without permission. This legal structure ensured property concentration in Spanish/Criollo hands while preventing non-Spanish accumulation.

The mechanism of divide and rule: By creating legal distinctions between categories and providing slight privileges to intermediate categories, Spanish system prevented unified resistance. Mestizos aspired to Spanish status rather than allying with indigenous peoples. Indigenous communities maintained separate identity from African-descended populations. Each group competed for limited advantages within hierarchy rather than uniting to challenge hierarchy itself.

The numbers: By 1810, population estimates suggest: 15,000-20,000 Peninsulares (1%), 1.1-1.3 million Criollos (18-20%), 1.8-2.2 million Mestizos (30-35%), 3.5-4 million Indigenous (60-65%), 10,000-20,000 Africans and descendants (< 1%). The majority (indigenous and mestizos) were fragmented by legal categories preventing unified challenge to Spanish/Criollo elite controlling property.

Conclusion: The Colonial Template That Would Persist

When New Spain approached independence in 1810, the colonial period had established structures that would survive every subsequent "revolution" for two centuries:

Property concentration: Perhaps 5,000-10,000 families owned 80-90% of land. The church controlled 40-50% of valuable property. Indigenous peoples retained 10-15% of territory on marginal lands. This concentration resulted from 300 years of systematic appropriation built on demographic catastrophe and legal frameworks denying indigenous property rights.

Legal frameworks: Spanish property law established principles that Mexican law would maintain: individual ownership privileged over communal, formal title superior to traditional use, purchase and grant created legitimate ownership regardless of original appropriation, inheritance law protected dynasty formation, and property rights were absolute against popular claims.

Labor subordination: Debt peonage created system where 60-70% of rural population was legally "free" but functionally enslaved through mechanisms that would continue operating after independence. The system didn't require chattel slavery—debt and law created subordination just as effective.

Elite networks: Intermarriage among 1,000-2,000 wealthiest families created coordinated elite transcending individual interests. These networks would survive independence as Creole elite simply replaced Peninsular officials while maintaining all property relationships.

Racial fragmentation: Caste system prevented unified resistance by creating legal hierarchies fragmenting majority populations. This mechanism would continue after independence through different categories—but same principle of divide and rule.

The church-elite alliance: Catholic institutions owned vast properties and provided ideological justification for inequality. This alliance would survive independence and persist even through liberal "reform" that nominally attacked church power.

The export economy: Silver mining and agricultural exports enriched elite while impoverishing masses. This pattern—economic growth benefiting property owners, not workers—would continue through every subsequent period.

What independence would NOT change: The property distribution established by colonial appropriation. The hacienda system subordinating labor. The elite families controlling wealth. The legal frameworks protecting concentration. Indigenous peoples remained dispossessed. The church maintained vast holdings. Debt peonage continued operating.

The colonial period created template demonstrating that property concentration rooted in genocide and appropriation becomes "legitimate" ownership protected by law across political transformations. The indigenous peoples who controlled 100% of territory in 1519 controlled 10-15% by 1810—and would control even less after liberal reforms. The Spanish conquistador descendants who appropriated 85-90% would maintain this through independence, reform, revolution, and into present day—often as the same families.

Understanding Mexican history for next 200 years requires understanding this foundation. Every "revolution" would promise to dismantle colonial inheritance. Every "revolution" would preserve

property structures while changing political sovereignty or ideological rhetoric. The elite families enriched by colonial appropriation would remain Mexico's elite—adapting to independence, surviving reform, weathering revolution, and prospering under democracy.

The template was established. The pattern would persist.

[End of Part 1 of 5]

Part 2 Preview: *Independence Through Porfiriato: Elite Transitions Without Redistribution (1810-1910)* will document how independence, liberal reform, and Porfirian "progress" all operated within colonial property structures—showing how revolutionary rhetoric served elite power transitions while concentration accelerated to 97% landless by 1910, creating conditions that made genuine revolution inevitable.

Mexico: Three Centuries of Revolutionary Rhetoric and Elite Continuity

Part 2 of 5: Independence Through Porfiriato - Elite Transitions Without Redistribution (1810-1910)

Introduction: Three Revolutions, Zero Redistribution

Between 1810 and 1910, Mexico experienced three major political transformations that elites and historians would call "revolutions": independence establishing sovereignty (1810-1821), liberal reform "modernizing" property law (1855-1876), and Porfirian "progress" through scientific development (1876-1910). Each mobilized enormous popular energy. Each promised transformation benefiting common people. Each used revolutionary rhetoric about freedom, equality, and justice. Each fundamentally changed political institutions and ideological frameworks.

And each preserved—often accelerated—the property concentration established during colonial period.

The pattern was systematic and devastating. Independence transferred sovereignty from Spanish crown to Creole elite without touching hacienda system or debt peonage. Miguel Hidalgo promised land redistribution and was executed by conservative forces that included wealthy Creoles. José María Morelos advocated racial equality and property reform and was similarly eliminated. The independence that succeeded was led by conservative Agustín de Iturbide explicitly protecting church wealth, hacienda properties, and racial hierarchies. The colonial property structure remained intact with Mexican flags replacing Spanish ones.

Liberal reform promised even more dramatic transformation—destroying church power, "modernizing" property law, and creating individual rights. The reality was catastrophic for indigenous peoples. The Ley Lerdo (1856) forced sale of church and communal lands. Church properties went to existing elite and new speculators, not peasants. Indigenous pueblo communal holdings were divided and sold—destroying the last significant indigenous land base. Communities lost perhaps 40-50% of remaining lands between 1856-1910. "Modernization" meant eliminating barriers to elite accumulation.

The Porfiriato brought the pattern to logical extreme. Porfirio Díaz governed (1876-1910) promising "Order and Progress." What Mexico got was the most concentrated property ownership in hemisphere—perhaps the world. By 1910, 97% of rural families were landless. Approximately 1-2% owned 90-95% of land. The Terrazas family controlled 2.5 million hectares. The Sánchez Navarro estates exceeded 6 million hectares. Individual haciendas reached scales

comparable to small European countries. Meanwhile, 10-12 million Mexicans lived in debt peonage or worse subordination than colonial period.

This concentration made revolution inevitable. But understanding why three prior "revolutions" preserved property concentration explains why Mexican Revolution would be the only successful Latin American land reform—and why even that redistribution would eventually be reversed. The colonial template's resilience across independence, reform, and progress demonstrated that property law and elite coordination transcend political transformation when fundamental ownership structures remain protected.

I. Independence and the First Elite Transition (1810-1821)

Hidalgo's Radical Beginning and Conservative Elimination

On September 16, 1810, Father Miguel Hidalgo issued the Grito de Dolores beginning Mexican independence movement. His immediate demands were revolutionary: end tribute payments indigenous peoples owed to crown, return lands stolen from indigenous communities, abolish slavery, and establish racial equality. The popular response was overwhelming—within weeks, Hidalgo commanded 80,000-100,000 followers, primarily indigenous peoples and mestizos believing the priest promised genuine transformation.

The movement's composition revealed its threat: Hidalgo's army was peasant mobilization seeking land redistribution and racial justice. They attacked Spanish-owned properties, killed Peninsular administrators, and began occupying haciendas. The violence was substantial—perhaps 2,000-3,000 Spanish and Criollos killed in early months. But the violence was selective—targeting Peninsulares while largely sparing Criollo elite. Hidalgo understood he needed Criollo support but his followers demanded immediate transformation.

The elite response was swift and unified: Both Peninsular and Criollo elites recognized that genuine indigenous mobilization threatened all property regardless of owner nationality. The colonial regime mobilized professional military forces. Hidalgo's peasant army, despite numerical superiority, lacked military training and weapons. At Calderón Bridge (January 1811), Spanish forces defeated Hidalgo's 100,000 with 6,000 professional troops. Hidalgo fled north, was captured, and executed (July 1811). The Spanish military displayed his head in Guanajuato for ten years—demonstrating what happened to those who mobilized indigenous peoples for redistribution.

Why Hidalgo failed structurally: His movement threatened property fundamentally. Elite unity against redistribution transcended Peninsular-Criollo tensions. The professional military remained loyal to property protection. International support (United States, Britain) was absent because Hidalgo's radical land reform threatened their interests. Hidalgo mobilized masses but

couldn't build elite coalition necessary for success. The lesson was clear—genuine redistributive demands meant elimination.

Morelos: The Radical Alternative Also Eliminated

José María Morelos assumed independence leadership (1811-1815) after Hidalgo's death. Morelos was more sophisticated politically and militarily—creating effective guerrilla forces controlling southern Mexico and convening constitutional congress (1813). His vision was explicitly transformative:

The Sentimientos de la Nación (1813): Morelos's constitutional proposal included: abolition of slavery and racial castes, equal taxation for all classes, division of large haciendas into small properties, increase in wages for poor, and prohibition of torture and monopolies. These were most radical proposals in Latin American independence movements—directly threatening property concentration.

The Chilpancingo Constitution (1814): The congress Morelos convened produced constitution establishing popular sovereignty, universal male suffrage, property rights subordinated to social welfare, and explicit commitment to land redistribution. This constitution was never implemented but revealed what genuine revolutionary transformation might have looked like.

Morelos's execution (1815): Spanish forces captured Morelos and executed him. Like Hidalgo, Morelos represented redistributive challenge that elite would not tolerate. His death eliminated independence movement's radical wing. Subsequent independence leaders would be conservative Criollos protecting property.

Iturbide and Conservative Independence

Agustín de Iturbide—ironically a Criollo military officer who had fought against Hidalgo and Morelos—led the independence that succeeded. His Plan de Iguala (1821) established three guarantees that made independence acceptable to conservative elite:

The Three Guarantees:

1. **Religion:** Catholicism as sole religion, church properties protected
2. **Independence:** Mexican sovereignty but under constitutional monarchy
3. **Union:** Peninsulares and Criollos would have equal rights

What the plan did NOT include: Land redistribution, indigenous rights recognition, abolition of debt peonage, racial equality beyond formal equal rights, or any property transformation. Iturbide's independence protected everything Spanish colonial system had established—transferring sovereignty while maintaining social and economic structures.

Why this independence succeeded: Conservative Criollo elite supported it because property was protected. Church supported it because wealth was guaranteed. Spanish officials exhausted from decade of warfare accepted it. International powers (Britain especially) welcomed it because it opened Mexican markets without threatening property. The Spanish military commander and Viceroy essentially negotiated handover because continued resistance was futile.

The September 1821 result: Mexican independence achieved. Spanish sovereignty ended. Criollo elite assumed political control. And the hacienda system, debt peonage, church landholdings, indigenous dispossession, and property concentration—all continued unchanged. The flags changed. The property structures remained identical.

Property Statistics 1810 vs. 1821: What Didn't Change

Land ownership concentration:

- 1810: Approximately 5,000-10,000 families owned 80-90% of land
- 1821: Approximately 5,000-10,000 families owned 80-90% of land
- The families were often identical—Criollo elite who had owned under Spain owned under Mexico

Indigenous pueblo lands:

- 1810: Perhaps 10-15% of territory in communal holdings
- 1821: Perhaps 10-15%—independence didn't redistribute any land to communities

Church property:

- 1810: Church owned 40-50% of valuable urban and rural property
- 1821: Church maintained 40-50%—Plan de Iguala explicitly protected church wealth

Debt peonage:

- 1810: 60-70% of rural population subordinated through debt
- 1821: 60-70%—independence changed nothing about labor relations
- The same peons worked the same haciendas for the same elite families

The devastating comparison:

- Miguel Hidalgo mobilized 100,000 indigenous peoples and mestizos expecting land redistribution
- José María Morelos fought for six years promising property transformation
- Both were executed
- Iturbide granted independence preserving all colonial property relationships
- The peasants who fought for Hidalgo and Morelos received nothing
- The Criollo elite who opposed them received sovereignty

The pattern established: Revolutionary rhetoric mobilizes popular energy for elite power transitions. Genuine redistributive demands trigger elite unity and violent suppression. Independence that succeeds is independence that protects property. This pattern would repeat throughout Mexican history.

II. Liberal Reform: "Modernization" Accelerating Dispossession (1855-1876)

The Santa Anna Dictatorship and Liberal Opposition

Between independence (1821) and liberal reform (1855), Mexico experienced political chaos—approximately 50 governments in 30 years, regional caudillo conflicts, loss of Texas (1836), catastrophic defeat in Mexican-American War (1846-1848) losing 55% of territory, and conservative-liberal factional warfare. Throughout this instability, property concentration remained unchanged. The same families owned the same haciendas regardless of which caudillo controlled national government.

Antonio López de Santa Anna's final dictatorship (1853-1855) provoked liberal revolution. Santa Anna represented old colonial order—alliance between church, military, and landed elite maintaining hierarchical society. The liberals who overthrew him (1855) promised radical transformation: attack church power as obstacle to progress, establish constitutional government protecting individual rights, create modern property law enabling economic development, secularize education and social services, and reduce military privilege.

The liberal vision was explicit modernization: Mexico had lost Mexican-American War because backward colonial institutions prevented development. Church landholding prevented productive use. Communal indigenous holdings prevented individual enterprise. Racial hierarchies prevented merit-based advancement. Liberal reform would transform Mexico into modern nation through property law changes and institutional modernization.

The Ley Lerdo (1856): Destroying Communal Property

The Ley Lerdo (June 25, 1856) was centerpiece of liberal reform. The law prohibited "civil and ecclesiastical corporations" from owning real estate except buildings directly used for their purposes. This meant: Catholic church must sell all agricultural lands and most urban properties, indigenous pueblos must divide communal lands into individual parcels, municipalities could not own property, and any corporate landholding (except mining/industrial companies) must be dissolved.

The liberal justification: Communal ownership and church mortmain prevented land from being used productively. "Dead hands" holding property meant capital didn't circulate. Individual

ownership would enable land markets, encourage improvement, attract investment, and promote development. The rhetoric was progress and modernization.

The reality—massive transfer to existing elite:

Church lands: Perhaps 3-5 million hectares of church agricultural property plus extensive urban real estate went to sale. The prices were nominal (tenants had first option to purchase at rental capitalization). But tenants were often existing elite families who had rented church properties for generations. They simply converted rental to ownership at favorable terms. New purchasers were Criollo and foreign speculators with capital—not peasants who had no money to buy.

Result: Church institutional ownership became elite family ownership. The same lands that had generated church revenues now generated revenues for elite purchasers. Peasants who had rented church properties as tenants became tenants of new owners—often with worse terms because private owners were more aggressive rent collectors than church had been.

Indigenous communal lands—the catastrophic impact:

The Ley Lerdo's application to indigenous pueblos was devastating. Communal pueblo holdings had protected indigenous communities from complete dispossession. Forcing division and sale destroyed this protection:

The mechanisms of indigenous land loss:

1. **Forced division:** Pueblos had to divide communal lands into individual parcels assigned to families
2. **Sale requirements:** Individual parcels must be titled and made alienable (sellable)
3. **Debt exploitation:** Elite offered loans to indigenous families needing cash, taking land titles as collateral
4. **Legal manipulation:** Spanish literacy required for title registration; indigenous peoples often couldn't navigate legal system
5. **Outright fraud:** Land speculators and hacienda owners used false documentation to claim pueblo parcels

The numbers tell the tragedy:

- 1856: Indigenous pueblos held approximately 10-15% of Mexican territory
- 1876: Indigenous holdings reduced to approximately 5-8% of territory
- Loss of 40-50% of remaining indigenous lands in two decades
- Perhaps 2-3 million hectares transferred from communal to private ownership—overwhelmingly to hacienda owners and speculators

Why this happened: Indigenous communities had held land communally for defensive reasons—individual ownership made land vulnerable to appropriation. The liberal "reform" eliminated the legal protection communal ownership provided. Market mechanisms combined

with elite capital and legal advantages ensured that "free" land sales transferred property from indigenous communities to existing elite.

The Constitution of 1857 and Property Law

The liberal Constitution of 1857 established legal framework that would govern Mexico through Porfiriato and survive into 20th century. Its property provisions demonstrated how "progressive" constitutional law could accelerate elite accumulation:

Article 27 (original version): Established that property rights were fundamental but subordinated to public interest. This sounded protective of social welfare. But "public interest" was defined as economic development—meaning infrastructure, resource extraction, and agricultural expansion. Elite hacienda expansion qualified as "public interest." Indigenous communities defending traditional lands did not.

Individual vs. communal rights: Constitution privileged individual property ownership over communal holdings. This was framed as equality—all citizens had equal rights to own property individually. But this "equality" destroyed indigenous communal land tenure that had protected communities. Legal equality produced substantive inequality when groups started with vastly different resources.

Mortgage and credit law: Constitution protected creditor rights and facilitated land mortgage markets. This enabled elite to finance hacienda expansion through credit while indigenous peoples couldn't access capital markets. The legal framework for financialization benefited those with existing assets.

The judicial system: Constitutional courts resolved property disputes based on formal legal documentation. Spanish-language titles, recorded deeds, and professional legal representation determined outcomes. Elite possessed all these advantages. Indigenous communities relying on traditional tenure and oral agreements lost systematically when disputes reached courts.

The Reform War (1858-1861) and French Intervention

Conservative elite and church attempted reversing liberal reforms through Reform War (1858-1861). This civil war killed perhaps 200,000 people—demonstrating how far conservatives would go protecting church property. Liberals won after three years of brutal warfare. But conservative resistance continued—inviting French intervention (1862-1867) installing Habsburg Archduke Maximilian as Mexican emperor.

What's crucial for property analysis: Both liberals and conservatives fought over church property and political control. Neither side advocated land redistribution to indigenous communities or debt peons. The Reform War and French Intervention rotated power among elite factions but didn't threaten fundamental hacienda system. When liberals won definitively (1867), property concentration had increased because warfare disrupted small holders while large haciendas survived through capital reserves and political connections.

Indigenous Resistance and Liberal Violence

Liberal reform triggered indigenous resistance across Mexico. Communities recognized that division and sale of pueblo lands meant dispossession. The resistance was widespread and fierce:

The Yaqui Wars (Sonora): Yaqui indigenous peoples resisted Mexican encroachment on their territories throughout 1800s. Liberal reforms justifying appropriation of Yaqui lands intensified conflict. Between 1825-1901, Yaqui fought repeated wars against Mexican forces. The liberal and later Porfirian response was genocidal—perhaps 30,000+ Yaquis killed, many enslaved and deported to Yucatán henequen plantations.

The Caste War (Yucatán 1847-1901): Maya peoples revolted against hacienda expansion and forced labor in henequen production. This was longest indigenous rebellion in Mexican history—lasting 50+ years. Liberal reforms accelerated Maya dispossession providing legal justification for war. Mexican forces used scorched earth tactics. Perhaps 200,000 deaths over conflict's duration. The "peace" came when Maya territories were converted into haciendas worked by imported Chinese labor.

Smaller regional resistance: Indigenous communities throughout central and southern Mexico resisted liberal reforms through revolts, legal appeals, and non-compliance. Liberal governments used military force systematically. The pattern was identical: indigenous resistance → military suppression → land appropriation justified as punishment for rebellion → hacienda expansion into former indigenous territories.

The liberal ideology justifying violence: Liberals framed resistance as backward Indians opposing progress. Indigenous communal land tenure was "primitive" obstacle to development. Violence against indigenous peoples was necessary to bring civilization. This ideology naturalized genocide as modernization—enabling elite appropriation while claiming to help Mexico advance.

III. The Porfiriato: Peak Oligarchic Concentration (1876-1910)

Díaz's Rise and the Científico Ideology

Porfirio Díaz assumed power through coup (1876) and ruled until revolution (1910)—with brief interruption 1880-1884 when ally governed maintaining Díaz's policies. The Porfiriato represented liberal reform's logical conclusion: complete subordination of property rights to elite accumulation justified through positivist "scientific" ideology.

The Científicos: Díaz relied on technocratic advisors called Científicos (scientists) who embraced Auguste Comte's positivism. Their ideology was explicit: Mexico's problem was indigenous and mestizo racial inferiority preventing development, solution was European immigration improving racial stock, attracting foreign capital to develop resources, concentrating land ownership for efficient large-scale production, and authoritarian "Order" enabling "Progress." This scientific racism provided sophisticated justification for policies that created most extreme property concentration in hemisphere.

The development model: Porfiriato emphasized export-oriented growth through foreign investment. British and American capital built railways (24,000 kilometers by 1910), developed mining (especially copper and silver), purchased haciendas and resource extraction operations, and financed infrastructure. Mexican GDP grew approximately 2.5-3% annually 1876-1910. But this growth enriched foreign investors and Mexican elite while impoverishing masses.

The Deslinde Laws: Surveying as Appropriation

The most important Porfirian legislation for land concentration was the deslinde (surveying) laws beginning 1883. These laws authorized private surveying companies to "survey and identify" vacant lands (terrenos baldíos) with compensation of one-third of lands surveyed:

The mechanism:

Surveying companies received contracts identifying "vacant" lands. Companies surveyed territories claiming to find empty lands. They received one-third of surveyed land as payment. Remaining two-thirds were sold to purchasers (often companies themselves or allied elite).

The fraud: Much land designated "vacant" was actually indigenous pueblo holdings, individually-occupied traditional lands without formal titles, or smallholder properties lacking Spanish documentation. Indigenous communities and small holders who couldn't produce formal legal titles lost lands to surveying companies. The legal burden was proof of ownership—which indigenous peoples often couldn't provide because Spanish colonial law hadn't recognized their holdings.

The scale of appropriation:

- Between 1883-1906: Approximately 50 million hectares were "surveyed" and transferred
- This represented roughly 25% of Mexico's territory
- Surveying companies and purchasers acquired land at costs of 1-5 pesos per hectare
- Market value was 20-100 pesos per hectare—representing massive wealth transfer

Who received these lands?

- American and British companies acquired 10-15 million hectares
- Mexican elite families (often with foreign partnerships) acquired 20-25 million hectares
- Surveying companies themselves retained 15-20 million hectares
- Indigenous communities lost perhaps 5-10 million hectares

- Small holders lost 2-5 million hectares

Example—the Richardson Construction Company: This American firm surveyed and acquired over 3 million hectares in Baja California, Chihuahua, and Sonora between 1884-1889. The company paid approximately 3 million pesos total. Land value was estimated at 60-100 million pesos. This represented 95-97% windfall from legal appropriation of lands Mexican indigenous peoples had occupied for centuries.

Peak Concentration: The Statistics of 1910

By 1910, Mexico achieved property concentration exceeding any society not using chattel slavery:

Land ownership concentration:

- 834 families owned approximately 20% of Mexico's entire territory
- Perhaps 1-2% of population owned 90-95% of agricultural land
- 97% of rural families (approximately 10-12 million people) were landless
- This concentration exceeded Russia's, exceeded any European society, approached feudal maximums

Individual hacienda scales:

The Terrazas family (Chihuahua):

- Luis Terrazas and family controlled approximately 2.5-3 million hectares
- This exceeded the size of Belgium
- Family wealth estimated at 50-60 million pesos
- Controlled banks, mines, commerce, and dominated Chihuahua politics

The Sánchez Navarro family (Coahuila):

- Holdings exceeded 6-7 million hectares by 1910
- Larger than Denmark
- Family maintained properties acquired in colonial period plus Porfirian expansion
- Controlled entire economic and political system in region

Other mega-estates:

- Hearst family (American): 3+ million hectares across northern states
- Guggenheim interests: 2+ million hectares mining and ranching operations
- British land companies: 5-10 million hectares collectively
- Dozens of Mexican families with 100,000-500,000 hectare holdings

The comparison to colonial period:

- Colonial era (1810): Perhaps 5-10% owning 80-90%
- Porfiriato (1910): Perhaps 1-2% owning 90-95%
- Concentration had INCREASED despite independence and liberal "reform"
- Both "revolutions" accelerated the dispossession colonial period began

Debt Peonage Intensified

The labor system under Porfiriato was arguably worse than colonial period:

How debt peonage operated 1876-1910:

Recruitment: Haciendas used labor contractors (enganchadores) who advanced money to rural poor—typically 50-150 pesos. Worker signed contract agreeing to work until debt repaid. Interest rates of 20-40% annually meant debts grew faster than wages could repay.

The company store: Hacienda tienda de raya charged prices 200-400% above market. Workers could only purchase from hacienda stores. Weekly wages of 25-50 centavos per day were insufficient for store prices. Workers fell deeper into debt weekly.

Legal enforcement: Porfirian law treated debt as criminal matter. Workers attempting to leave while indebted faced imprisonment or return by force. Hacienda owners could sell worker debts to other estates—transferring workers like property. Rural police (rurales) tracked fugitive workers and returned them.

Intergenerational transmission: Children inherited parental debts automatically. A child born to indebted parents inherited perhaps 200-500 peso debt before performing any labor. The child would die indebted, as would their children. The system created hereditary subordination across generations.

Violence maintaining discipline: Hacienda owners employed private police and overseers who whipped workers, imprisoned them in estate jails, and occasionally killed resisters. Porfirian legal system provided effective immunity—hacienda owners were rarely prosecuted for violence against peons.

The statistics:

- Perhaps 3-5 million rural workers lived under debt peonage
- Average debts of 200-400 pesos (representing 2-4 years wages)
- Perhaps 70-80% of rural families subordinated through debt or similar mechanisms
- The "freedom" from colonial period existed in name only

Working conditions: Workers labored sunrise to sunset (12-14 hours daily). Wages averaged 25-50 centavos daily (10-18 pesos annually). Food consisted of corn, beans, and chile—bare subsistence. Housing was one-room adobe shacks without sanitation. Disease rates were extreme—malaria, typhus, dysentery. Life expectancy for peons was perhaps 30-40 years.

Elite Wealth and Lifestyle

The concentration at top was obscene:

The wealthiest Mexicans:

- Luis Terrazas: 50-60 million pesos (roughly $25-30 million dollars 1910)
- Iñigo Noriega: 40-50 million pesos (commercial and agricultural empire)
- Multiple families with 10-30 million peso fortunes
- Perhaps 100-200 families with assets exceeding 1 million pesos

The comparison: A peon earned 10-18 pesos annually. The Terrazas fortune represented 3-4 million years of peon labor. A single family's wealth exceeded total annual income of perhaps 500,000-1,000,000 Mexican workers.

Elite lifestyle: Mexican oligarchy built French-style mansions in Mexico City, educated children in European schools, vacationed in Paris and New York, purchased European art and furnishings, employed dozens of domestic servants, and hosted elaborate social events costing more than their peons earned in lifetimes. The contrast between elite luxury and popular misery reached grotesque extremes.

Foreign Capital and National Subordination

Porfirian development policy privileged foreign investment:

Foreign ownership patterns:

- American investors owned approximately 50-55% of railways
- British capital controlled perhaps 30-35% of railways
- American mining companies controlled 80-85% of copper production
- British controlled majority of petroleum operations
- Americans owned 10-15 million hectares of agricultural/ranching land
- European banking dominated financial sector

The nationalist resentment: Mexican middle class and intellectuals recognized that Porfirian policies subordinated national development to foreign capital. Revenues from mines, railways, and agriculture flowed abroad. Foreign workers received higher wages than Mexican workers doing identical jobs. Political decisions favored foreign investors over Mexican interests. This nationalist resentment would fuel revolutionary ideology.

But note what nationalists opposed: Foreign ownership, not ownership concentration itself. Mexican nationalists wanted Mexican elite controlling economy—not redistribution to workers and peasants. Revolutionary nationalism would challenge foreign capital while accepting Mexican elite property if "properly" regulated.

The Inevitable Revolution

By 1910, Mexico's contradictions were unsustainable:

The concentration statistics:

- 1-2% owned 90-95% of land
- 97% of rural families were landless
- 70-80% lived under debt peonage or similar subordination
- Life expectancy for poor Mexicans was 30-40 years
- Infant mortality exceeded 40-50%
- Literacy for lower classes was 10-15%

The contrast:

- Elite wealth in millions
- GDP growth averaging 2.5-3% annually
- Mexico City's Paseo de la Reforma rivaled European boulevards
- Railways connected the country
- Foreign capital flowed in billions
- But 80-85% of population lived in desperate poverty

The political illegitimacy:

- Díaz had ruled 30+ years through electoral fraud
- No political channel for change existed
- Regional caudillos were suppressed or co-opted
- Independent media was censored
- Labor organizing was criminalized
- Political opposition leaders were imprisoned or exiled

The trigger: Díaz's 1910 declaration that he would seek reelection again broke final legitimacy. Francisco Madero—a northern elite reformer—declared revolution (November 1910). Madero's Plan de San Luis Potosí promised political democracy and modest land reform. The response demonstrated accumulated grievances—across Mexico, peasants rose demanding land, workers struck demanding rights, and regional movements mobilized armies.

The Mexican Revolution (1910-1920) would kill 1-2 million people—approximately 10% of population. It would be the only successful Latin American land reform. But understanding why revolution became necessary requires understanding that three prior "revolutions" (independence, liberal reform, Porfirian "progress") had systematically preserved and accelerated property concentration. The colonial appropriation that began in 1521 had reached its logical extreme by 1910. What followed was inevitable response to 400 years of accumulated dispossession.

Conclusion: Colonial Template Survived Three Transformations

The century from independence (1810) to revolution (1910) demonstrated with perfect clarity that political transformation without property redistribution preserves elite power:

Independence (1810-1821):

- Revolutionary rhetoric: Freedom, sovereignty, end Spanish tyranny
- Hidalgo and Morelos promised land redistribution—both executed
- Iturbide granted independence protecting church wealth and haciendas
- Property concentration: UNCHANGED

Liberal Reform (1855-1876):

- Revolutionary rhetoric: Modernization, progress, individual rights, attack church power
- Ley Lerdo transferred church lands to elite, destroyed indigenous communal holdings
- Constitution of 1857 privileged individual property enabling dispossession
- Property concentration: INCREASED (indigenous lost 40-50% of remaining lands)

Porfiriato (1876-1910):

- Revolutionary rhetoric: Order and Progress, scientific development, civilization
- Deslinde laws appropriated 50 million hectares through legal "surveying"
- Peak concentration: 97% landless, 1-2% owning 90-95%
- Property concentration: MAXIMIZED

The pattern across all three:

Phase 1—Revolutionary rhetoric: Each transformation mobilized popular support with promises of change. Each appealed to genuine grievances. Each claimed to represent progress against backward old order.

Phase 2—Elite capture: Each transformation was led by or captured by elite protecting property. Radicals who genuinely threatened redistribution (Hidalgo, Morelos) were eliminated. Conservatives or moderate liberals who protected property succeeded.

Phase 3—Legal frameworks enabling appropriation: Each transformation created new legal mechanisms transferring property to elite. Independence converted colonial grants to Mexican ownership. Liberal reform destroyed communal protections. Porfiriato surveying laws appropriated indigenous territories.

Phase 4—Accelerated concentration: Each transformation resulted in property concentrating further. The elite families who prospered under Spain prospered after independence. Liberal

reform enriched speculators and hacienda owners. Porfiriato created oligarchy exceeding colonial concentration.

The families demonstrate continuity:

The Sánchez Navarro family accumulated estates during colonial period, survived independence controlling same properties, expanded during liberal reform purchasing church and indigenous lands, and peaked during Porfiriato with 6+ million hectares. Across 300+ years and three "revolutions," the same family maintained and expanded wealth through every political transformation.

This pattern repeated across Mexican elite: colonial origins → independence without loss → liberal reform expansion → Porfirian peak. The revolutions changed sovereignty, ideology, and political institutions. The property remained concentrated in the same families.

What made revolution necessary:

By 1910, concentration had reached unsustainable extreme. The contradiction between development rhetoric and popular immiseration was undeniable. Political channels for change didn't exist. The Porfirian system's rigidity prevented adaptation. When Díaz declared another reelection, accumulated grievances from 400 years of appropriation exploded.

The Mexican Revolution would be different from independence and reform precisely because property concentration had reached the point where transformation required violence destroying old elite's military and political power. But even that successful revolution would see its redistributions systematically reversed through market mechanisms and legal reform—demonstrating elite power's resilience even after genuine expropriation.

The next part documents the only successful Latin American land reform—and explains why even revolutionary redistribution proved reversible when property law frameworks and market forces enabled reconcentration. The colonial template's defeat required decade of warfare killing 1-2 million. Its reconstitution required only legal reform and market mechanisms operating over three generations.

[End of Part 2 of 5]

Part 3 Preview: *The Mexican Revolution: Genuine Redistribution That Was Reversed (1910-1940)* will document the only successful Latin American land reform, analyzing how the ejido system redistributed 47-50% of land to 3+ million families under Cárdenas, why this succeeded when nothing else in Latin America did, what the Revolution did NOT redistribute, and how the PRI system managed reconcentration 1940-1982 preparing for neoliberal counter-revolution.

Mexico: Three Centuries of Revolutionary Rhetoric and Elite Continuity

Part 3 of 5: The Mexican Revolution - Genuine Redistribution That Was Reversed (1910-1940)

Introduction: The Exception That Proves the Rule

The Mexican Revolution (1910-1920) and its consolidation under Lázaro Cárdenas (1934-1940) achieved what no other Latin American movement accomplished: genuine land redistribution expropriating oligarchic estates and transferring property to millions of peasant families. By 1940, approximately 47-50% of agricultural land was held in ejidos (communal land grants) benefiting 3+ million families. The hacienda system that had persisted since conquest was destroyed. The oligarchy that had owned 90-95% of land in 1910 was eliminated as political and economic force.

This makes Mexico the critical test case. Argentina never attempted redistribution—elites preserved colonial property structures across 200+ years through every "revolution." But Mexico actually expropriated oligarchic estates, killed or exiled old elite families, and created new property system through constitutional mandate and state enforcement. If elite power is truly as resilient as this collection argues, then even Mexican Revolution's genuine redistribution should prove reversible.

And it was. By 2025, property concentration in Mexico approaches Porfirian levels. The ejido system established 1920-1940 has been systematically undermined through economic mechanisms making ejidos unviable, legal reforms enabling privatization and sale, and reconcentration in corporate and elite hands. The descendants of revolutionary generals who received land in 1920s-1930s have become new oligarchy. Foreign corporations and drug cartels control vast territories. The land reform that cost 1-2 million lives has been largely reversed across three generations.

Understanding why requires analyzing three distinct phases: (1) the revolutionary period 1910-1920 when military victory destroyed old elite, (2) the Cárdenas redistribution 1934-1940 when land reform reached peak, and (3) the PRI management 1940-1982 when ejido system was systematically undermined preparing for neoliberal counter-revolution. This part documents phases 1 and 2, showing both what made Mexican Revolution succeed and what its limitations were from the beginning.

The devastating lesson: even revolutionary expropriation eliminating old oligarchy proves reversible when new elite emerges from revolutionary winners, when ejido system contains structural limitations making it economically unviable, when PRI cooptation prevents peasant

organizations from defending gains, and when international economic integration makes subsistence agriculture impossible. The Mexican Revolution succeeded temporarily. Elite power reconstituted across generations. The pattern's resilience operates even through genuine disruption.

I. The Revolutionary Explosion (1910-1920)

Madero's Opening and Popular Mobilization

Francisco Madero's Plan de San Luis Potosí (October 1910) called for uprising against Díaz beginning November 20, 1910. Madero was northern elite reformer—son of wealthy landowner family, educated in France and United States, moderate liberal wanting political democracy without social revolution. His plan promised return of lands illegally taken from communities, but Madero envisioned limited redistribution through legal procedures, not massive expropriation.

The popular response exceeded Madero's control. Across Mexico, long-suppressed grievances exploded: Emiliano Zapata mobilized Morelos peasants demanding hacienda lands be returned to villages. Pancho Villa organized northern peasants and cowboys into División del Norte army. Pascual Orozco led Chihuahua uprising. Regional movements emerged throughout country. By May 1911, revolutionary forces controlled enough territory that Díaz resigned and fled to France. The Porfiriato collapsed in six months.

Why the old regime fell so quickly: The concentration had created millions with nothing to lose. Debt peonage meant workers had zero stake in existing system. Indigenous communities seeking land recovery had been organizing for decades. Regional caudillos suppressed under Díaz saw opportunity. The federal army was small (30,000-40,000) and many soldiers sympathized with revolution. International support for Díaz evaporated when U.S. recognized revolutionary legitimacy. Most critically, elite unity fractured—northern landowners like Madero opposed Díaz's centralization even while fearing radical redistribution.

Zapata's Plan de Ayala: The Radical Alternative

Madero's moderation became clear when he assumed presidency (November 1911) and attempted limited reforms satisfying neither oligarchy nor revolutionaries. Zapata—recognizing Madero wouldn't implement real land reform—issued Plan de Ayala (November 1911) articulating radical redistributive vision:

The Plan's key provisions:

- All lands, forests, and waters usurped by haciendas through deslinde laws or other means must be returned immediately to villages
- Haciendas opposing redistribution would be expropriated

- One-third of all hacienda lands must be redistributed regardless of legality of acquisition
- Compensation would be provided but determined by revolutionary authority
- Revolutionary forces would continue fighting until land reform was implemented

The significance: Zapata explicitly rejected property law's legitimacy. Haciendas claiming "legal" ownership through Porfirian deslinde laws or liberal Ley Lerdo purchases were still subject to expropriation because original appropriation was unjust. This was most radical property challenge in Mexican history—questioning not just current distribution but legitimacy of all titles traceable to colonial or liberal appropriation.

Zapata's base: The Zapatista army (Ejército Libertador del Sur) mobilized 20,000-30,000 armed peasants from Morelos and surrounding states. They controlled southern territories, implemented land redistribution in zones they held, and fought continuously 1911-1919. Zapatista zones demonstrated that immediate redistribution was possible—villages recovered hacienda lands, reestablished communal agriculture, and created peasant self-governance.

Villa and the Northern Revolutionary Armies

Pancho Villa's División del Norte represented different revolutionary stream—northern rancheros, cowboys, and peasants whose grievances focused more on political authoritarianism and labor conditions than land concentration (northern states had fewer haciendas and more ranching). But Villa's army (reaching 40,000-50,000 at peak) proved most effective military force:

Villa's significance: His victories demonstrated revolutionary forces could defeat federal army in conventional warfare. Battle of Zacatecas (June 1914) destroyed federal army's main force. Villa controlled northern states including Chihuahua—richest region. His military success forced elite recognition that revolution couldn't be suppressed through force alone. Villa also implemented land distribution in territories he controlled—though less systematically than Zapata.

The northern revolutionary coalition: Villa allied with other northern leaders (Álvaro Obregón, Venustiano Carranza) against Díaz and then against Madero's successor Victoriano Huerta (who had Madero assassinated February 1913). This coalition combined Villa's popular army, Obregón's military competence, and Carranza's elite legitimacy. Together they defeated Huerta (July 1914) and controlled Mexico.

The Revolutionary Split: Radicals vs. Moderates

With Huerta defeated, revolutionaries split between radical redistributionists (Zapata, Villa) and moderate constitutionalists (Carranza, Obregón). The Convention of Aguascalientes (October-November 1914) attempted unifying revolutionaries but revealed irreconcilable divisions:

Zapata and Villa demanded: Immediate implementation of Plan de Ayala, comprehensive land redistribution without compensation, constitutional mandate for permanent land reform, and revolutionary government led by those committed to social transformation.

Carranza and Obregón countered: Constitutional government first, land reform through legal procedures, compensation for expropriated properties, and moderate reform attracting middle-class and business support.

The civil war (1914-1915): Conventionalists (Zapata-Villa) vs. Constitutionalists (Carranza-Obregón) fought for control. Obregón's military superiority defeated Villa in series of major battles (Celaya April 1915, León June 1915). By late 1915, Constitutionalists controlled most of Mexico while Zapata held Morelos and Villa retreated to guerrilla warfare in Chihuahua. Perhaps 300,000-400,000 died in this phase of revolutionary fighting.

Why moderates won militarily: Obregón was superior general to Villa tactically. Carranza secured U.S. recognition and arms supplies. Constitutionalist coalition included military professionals and northern business elite providing resources. Moderate program attracted middle class wanting order. Most critically, Carranza promised land reform through constitutional process—co-opting revolutionary demands while avoiding immediate radical redistribution threatening property law.

The Constitution of 1917: Revolutionary Potential and Moderate Control

The Constitutional Convention (1916-1917) drafted constitution that would govern Mexico for century. Its property provisions (Article 27) were potentially revolutionary while maintaining state control over redistribution:

Article 27 established:

Property doctrine: The nation has original ownership of lands and waters; private property is concession from the state. This reversed liberal property law—instead of property rights being fundamental, they derived from state grant and were subject to social welfare limitations.

Expropriation authority: The state can expropriate private property for public interest with compensation. This enabled land reform legally. The critical question was "public interest" definition and compensation levels—which political power would determine.

Prohibition on corporate landholding: Religious institutions and corporations (except mining/industrial) could not own rural property. This prevented reconcentration through corporate mechanisms and attacked church power.

Restoration of communal lands: Villages (pueblos) that lost lands illegally could petition for restoration. This addressed liberal Ley Lerdo appropriations.

Land redistribution mandate: The state must subdivide large estates and create small property through ejido grants to landless peasants.

The significance and limitations:

Revolutionary potential: Article 27 provided constitutional basis for eliminating hacienda system. It established that property rights were subordinated to social welfare. It mandated land redistribution.

But moderate control: Implementation depended on government will. Compensation requirements could limit expropriation if set at market rates. The constitution didn't immediately redistribute land—it authorized future redistribution through political process. Carranza and successors could control pace and extent of reform.

The outcome: Article 27 enabled Cárdenas's massive redistribution (1934-1940). But it also enabled subsequent governments to slow, stop, or reverse redistribution. The constitution was revolutionary tool in revolutionary hands, conservative tool in conservative hands. Legal framework didn't determine outcomes—political power did.

II. The Revolutionary Settlement and Limited Redistribution (1917-1934)

Carranza's Minimal Land Reform (1917-1920)

Venustiano Carranza governed as constitutional president (1917-1920) implementing minimal land reform despite constitutional mandate. His redistribution totaled approximately 180,000-200,000 hectares to 48,000 families across three years. This represented less than 1% of agricultural land redistributed to less than 2% of landless families. Carranza's caution reflected his elite origins and coalition—he wanted constitutional legitimacy without threatening property fundamentally.

Why Carranza limited redistribution: He represented northern landowner elite. His coalition included business interests opposing radical change. U.S. recognition required reassuring American investors Mexican government wouldn't expropriate arbitrarily. The civil war with Zapata and Villa had exhausted Mexico—stability required not alienating remaining elite. Most critically, Carranza believed gradual legal reform, not revolutionary expropriation, should govern change.

The Zapatista response: Zapata rejected Carranza's legitimacy and continued resistance. Zapatista-controlled Morelos implemented radical redistribution autonomously. Carranza responded with military occupation and systematic repression. In April 1919, Carranza's forces assassinated Zapata through treacherous invitation to meeting. Zapata's death eliminated revolution's most uncompromising redistributive voice.

Obregón-Calles Consolidation (1920-1934)

Álvaro Obregón (1920-1924), Plutarco Elías Calles (1924-1928), and Calles-controlled presidencies (1928-1934) redistributed more land than Carranza but far less than revolutionary demands required:

Obregón's redistribution (1920-1924):

- Approximately 1.7 million hectares to 160,000 families
- This represented perhaps 5-8% of landless families receiving land
- Focused on creating loyal ejidos in strategic locations
- Used land reform as political tool—rewarding supporters, punishing opponents

Calles and Maximato (1924-1934):

- Approximately 3.2 million hectares distributed 1924-1934
- Combined with Obregón: perhaps 5 million hectares total 1920-1934
- Benefited approximately 750,000-800,000 families
- Still left 2.5-3 million landless families

Why redistribution remained limited:

Elite resistance: Despite revolutionary rhetoric, new elite was forming from revolutionary generals and their allies. These new elites acquired properties, established businesses, and opposed comprehensive redistribution threatening their accumulation.

Business pressure: Mexican and foreign businesses demanded property security. Obregón-Calles governments wanted foreign investment and loans—requiring reassuring international capital that Mexico respected property rights.

Institutional conservatism: As PNR party (future PRI) formed (1929), it created bureaucracy controlling redistribution. Agricultural ministry bureaucrats could slow applications, limit grants, favor political allies. The revolutionary energy was institutionalized and cooled.

The ejido system's design limitations: Even land that was redistributed came with restrictions preventing full ownership. Ejidos granted use rights, not full title. Ejidatarios couldn't sell land (preventing reconcentration but also preventing capital accumulation). Credit access was limited. Technical assistance was minimal. Many ejidos received marginal land.

What Wasn't Redistributed (1910-1934)

Critical analysis of revolutionary limitations:

Even during peak revolutionary period, large sectors of economy were protected:

Northern commercial agriculture: Sonora, Sinaloa, Baja California had large commercial farms producing for export (cotton, wheat, vegetables). These weren't traditional haciendas but

modern capitalist agriculture. Revolutionary governments exempted them from redistribution as "efficiently productive." This preserved concentration in most profitable regions.

Mining and industrial property: Foreign-owned mines and Mexican-owned industries weren't expropriated (except oil and railways nationalized later). Revolutionary governments wanted these operations continuing production. Worker demands for control were rejected—wage increases yes, ownership transfer no.

Urban property: Cities saw minimal redistribution. Elite families maintained valuable urban real estate. The revolution was primarily rural phenomenon. Urban workers got labor rights, not property.

Financial wealth: Banks and financial institutions weren't nationalized until 1982. Elite families maintained capital, converted it to industrial investment, and preserved wealth across political transformation. The revolution redistributed land but not financial assets.

"Small property" protection: Article 27 defined "small property" as immune from expropriation: 100 hectares irrigated land or 200 hectares seasonal crops or 300-800 hectares grazing land. These "small properties" were HUGE compared to ejido parcels (2-10 hectares average). Elite subdivided large haciendas into multiple "small properties" held by family members—preserving effective control while avoiding expropriation.

The pattern: Revolutionary redistribution targeted traditional haciendas in central/southern Mexico. Modern commercial agriculture in north was protected. Industrial/urban property was maintained. Financial wealth was preserved. The revolution transformed rural land tenure significantly but preserved capitalist property relations in modern economic sectors. New elite forming from revolutionary winners had vested interest in protecting these sectors.

III. Cárdenas and Peak Redistribution (1934-1940)

Why Cárdenas Was Different

Lázaro Cárdenas assumed presidency (1934) after Calles nominated him expecting another controllable puppet. Cárdenas shocked elite by actually implementing revolutionary land reform comprehensively. His presidency (1934-1940) achieved more redistribution than all previous governments combined.

What made Cárdenas unique:

Genuine commitment: Unlike Obregón-Calles who used land reform tactically, Cárdenas believed in it ideologically. He spent childhood in Michoacán seeing peasant poverty. His revolutionary service connected him to popular demands. He understood Mexican Revolution meant nothing if land wasn't redistributed.

Political will: Cárdenas broke with Calles (1935-1936), exiling the "jefe máximo" and purging Callistas from government. This eliminated conservative constraints. Cárdenas built independent base among workers and peasants—mobilizing them against elite opposition.

Economic resources: The mid-1930s saw agricultural price recovery from Depression. Oil nationalization (1938) generated revenues. Cárdenas had resources to compensate expropriated owners and support ejidos with credit and infrastructure.

International context: U.S. Good Neighbor Policy meant less intervention threat. European fascism and approaching WWII made U.S. prioritize hemispheric stability over property protection. Cárdenas had international space previous presidents lacked.

The Scale of Cárdenas Redistribution

The numbers document transformation:

Land redistributed (1934-1940):

- Approximately 18 million hectares distributed
- 800,000+ families received ejido grants
- This exceeded all previous redistribution combined
- Represented 20-25% of Mexico's agricultural land

Combined with previous redistribution (1915-1940):

- Total: Approximately 23-25 million hectares redistributed
- Total beneficiaries: 1.5-1.8 million families
- By 1940: 47-50% of agricultural land was in ejido system
- Approximately 3-4 million families had access to ejido lands

The hacienda system was destroyed:

- Largest estates expropriated and redistributed
- Terrazas family: 2.5 million hectares → ejidos
- Countless 100,000+ hectare estates broken up
- Old Porfirian oligarchy eliminated as economic force

Regional focus: Cárdenas prioritized regions with high landlessness and revolutionary history: Morelos (Zapata's base) received comprehensive redistribution. Laguna cotton region—wealthy commercial agriculture—was expropriated and collectivized 1936. Central Mexico hacienda zones were transformed. Even northern states with commercial agriculture saw significant redistribution.

The Ejido System: Structure and Limitations

The ejido was communal land grant with collective ownership and individual use rights:

How ejidos operated:

Grant process: Landless peasants petitioned government for land. Agricultural ministry reviewed application, identified hacienda land for expropriation, granted ejido to petitioning community. The ejido was granted to community as collective unit, not individuals.

Land use: Individual families received parcela (plot) within ejido for cultivation—typically 2-10 hectares depending on land quality and region. Some ejidos operated collectively with shared production. Most divided land for individual family farming.

Legal restrictions: Ejidatarios couldn't sell land (preventing reconcentration). Couldn't mortgage land for loans. Land remained ejido property—families had use rights. If family abandoned land, it reverted to ejido for redistribution. Inheritance passed to one heir (usually eldest son) who must work land.

Support structures: Ejidal banks provided credit. Government agricultural extension offered technical assistance. Rural schools educated ejido children. Healthcare clinics served ejido communities. Cárdenas built comprehensive support system.

The built-in limitations:

Plot sizes too small: Average ejido parcela was 4-8 hectares. This was subsistence-level holding. Families could feed themselves but couldn't accumulate capital or invest in improvements. Commercial agriculture required 20-100+ hectares.

Quality varied drastically: Best lands went to ejidos in some regions. But many ejidos received marginal land—hillsides, poor soil, inadequate water. Ejidatarios receiving poor land faced permanent poverty despite "owning" land.

Couldn't be sold/mortgaged: This prevented reconcentration but also prevented ejidatarios from accessing capital. Without collateral, banks wouldn't lend. Without loans, ejidatarios couldn't purchase equipment, fertilizer, improved seeds. The inalienability protecting against elite reappropriation also prevented capital accumulation.

Collective vs. individual tension: Some ejidos were collective enterprises requiring cooperation. Mexican peasant tradition was family farming. Collective ejidos often saw conflicts over work distribution, profit sharing, and management. Many collective ejidos eventually divided into family parcels.

Government dependency: Ejidatarios depended on government credit, technical assistance, and market access. This created political subordination—opposing government risked losing support. PRI would exploit this dependency making ejidatarios captive political base.

The Opposition and Violence

Cárdenas's redistribution triggered fierce elite resistance:

Landowner opposition: Expropriated hacendados (even with compensation) opposed losing properties their families held for generations. Some accepted compensation and invested in industry. Others resisted violently—hiring private armies (guardias blancas) attacking ejidos.

Business community: Mexican and foreign businesses feared comprehensive redistribution would expand to urban/industrial property. U.S. ambassador pressured Cárdenas. Oil companies coordinated boycott after nationalization (1938). International capital flight occurred.

Catholic Church: Church opposed agrarian reform as socialist/communist. Cristero Rebellion (1926-1929) had fought against Calles's anti-clerical policies. Church continued encouraging landowner resistance to Cárdenas.

Regional violence: In many areas, landowners' guardias blancas attacked ejidos, killed peasant leaders, and attempted preventing land distributions. Cárdenas responded by arming ejidatarios and deploying federal troops. Perhaps 5,000-10,000 died in conflicts over land distribution 1934-1940.

The conservative coalition: Large landowners, business elite, church, conservative politicians, and foreign investors coordinated opposing Cárdenas. They couldn't stop redistribution while Cárdenas held power but prepared for post-Cárdenas rollback.

What Cárdenas's Revolution Changed and Didn't Change

What changed dramatically:

Rural land tenure: 47-50% of agricultural land transferred from large estates to ejidos. This was genuine transformation destroying hacienda system that had persisted since conquest. The old oligarchy lost economic base.

Rural social relations: Debt peonage was eliminated. Ejidatarios were landowners (even if restricted), not subordinated laborers. Peasant organizations gained political power. Rural power relations transformed fundamentally.

Political system: Popular mobilization through peasant and worker organizations became PRI base. The state's relationship with rural populations shifted from repression to incorporation. Agrarian reform bureaucracy became massive institution managing countryside.

National consciousness: Cárdenas created sense that Mexican Revolution meant something—that promises of land reform were real. His presidency legitimated revolutionary government in ways previous leaders hadn't. Oil nationalization demonstrated economic nationalism was possible.

What didn't change or changed less:

Northern commercial agriculture: Sonora, Sinaloa, Baja California retained large commercial farms. These weren't traditional haciendas but modern capitalist agriculture producing for domestic and export markets. Cárdenas redistributed less here.

Urban/industrial property: Mexico City and industrial centers saw minimal property redistribution. Workers got labor rights, higher wages, union recognition. They didn't get factory ownership or urban land. Industrial capitalism remained intact.

Financial wealth: Elite families lost land but maintained capital. They invested in industry, commerce, finance, and services. New economic sectors absorbed displaced land wealth. Elite power shifted from land to industrial capital but persisted.

"Small property" preservation: The constitutional limit (100-800 hectares depending on use) protected substantial holdings. Families with political connections kept large "small properties." This would become mechanism for reconcentration.

Class structure: Mexico remained capitalist society with vast inequality. Ejidatarios got land but remained poor. New elite formed from revolutionary winners and industrialists. Wealth concentration in non-agricultural sectors continued. The revolution redistributed land, not wealth or power comprehensively.

Conclusion: Revolutionary Success and Built-In Limits

By 1940, Mexican Revolution had achieved unprecedented Latin American land reform:

The transformation:

- 23-25 million hectares redistributed to 1.5-1.8 million families
- 47-50% of agricultural land in ejido system
- 3-4 million families with ejido access
- Hacienda system destroyed
- Old oligarchy eliminated as dominant force
- Debt peonage ended

What made this possible:

- Revolutionary military victory destroying old elite's armed forces
- Constitutional mandate (Article 27) providing legal framework
- Cárdenas's genuine commitment and political will
- Economic resources from recovery and oil nationalization
- International space from Good Neighbor Policy
- Mass mobilization of peasants supporting redistribution

The historical significance:

- Only successful large-scale land reform in Latin America
- Demonstrated that revolutionary expropriation was possible
- Showed that centuries of property concentration could be reversed
- Created precedent that property rights weren't absolute

The built-in limitations:

Economic constraints: Ejido parcels were too small for commercial viability. Many received marginal land. Capital access was limited. Technical capacity was inadequate. International markets were unfavorable to peasant agriculture.

Legal restrictions: Inalienability prevented capital accumulation. Inheritance rules fragmented holdings across generations. Government dependency created political subordination. The ejido system protected against reconcentration but also prevented ejidatario wealth accumulation.

Incomplete transformation: Northern commercial agriculture largely preserved. Urban/industrial property protected. Financial wealth maintained. New elite forming from revolutionary winners. These sectors would become base for future reconcentration.

Political vulnerability: Redistribution depended on government will. Cárdenas implemented comprehensively. His successors could slow, stop, or reverse. PRI would use ejido dependency to control peasants politically while economically undermining system.

The devastating foreshadowing: Even at moment of peak redistribution (1940), seeds of reversal were planted. Ejidatarios received land but not resources to make it productive. "Small property" loopholes enabled elite to retain substantial holdings. Commercial agriculture in north demonstrated capitalist farming remained viable and profitable. New elite was forming. International economic integration would make subsistence ejido agriculture increasingly impossible.

The next 80 years would prove that even successful revolutionary expropriation is reversible when:

- Market pressures favor large-scale capitalist agriculture
- Legal reforms enable privatization and sale
- Government support is withdrawn making ejidos economically unviable
- New elite emerges capturing state power
- International economic integration subordinates national development

Mexican Revolution succeeded in destroying old oligarchy. Elite power would reconstitute through new mechanisms across three generations. The pattern's resilience operates even through genuine revolutionary disruption. Property concentration can be temporarily reversed. The forces concentrating it operate continuously to restore elite dominance through different structures.

[End of Part 3 of 5]

Part 4 Preview: *The PRI System and Neoliberal Counter-Revolution (1940-2018)* will document how the ejido system was systematically undermined through market mechanisms (1940-1982), how Salinas's Article 27 reform (1992) legalized reconcentration enabling land sales, how NAFTA accelerated peasant displacement, and how by 2020 property concentration approached Porfirian levels through legal reversal of revolutionary redistribution.

Mexico: Three Centuries of Revolutionary Rhetoric and Elite Continuity

Part 4 of 5: The PRI System and Neoliberal Counter-Revolution (1940-2018)

Introduction: The Systematic Reversal

When Lázaro Cárdenas left office in 1940, Mexican land reform appeared permanent. Constitutional Article 27 mandated redistribution. The ejido system controlled 47-50% of agricultural land. Three million families had received land. The hacienda oligarchy was destroyed. International observers called it the most successful land reform in Latin American history. The revolutionary promise appeared fulfilled.

Seventy-five years later, property concentration approaches Porfirian levels. The ejido system covers nominally similar percentages of land but generates perhaps 30-40% of agricultural output. Large commercial operations—often corporations or elite families—control 60-70% of agricultural value. Land Gini coefficient reaches 0.76-0.78 (extreme concentration). Estimates suggest 1-3% control majority of productive agricultural land. The revolutionary redistribution has been systematically reversed without requiring military coup or formal expropriation.

This reversal occurred through three distinct but overlapping mechanisms: (1) PRI management 1940-1982 undermining ejido economic viability while maintaining political control, (2) Salinas's Article 27 constitutional reform 1992 legalizing ejido privatization and sale, and (3) NAFTA integration 1994-present making peasant agriculture economically impossible through U.S. agricultural competition. Each phase operated legally and constitutionally. No dramatic coup was necessary. Market mechanisms and policy choices systematically reconcentrated property the Revolution had redistributed.

Understanding this reversal is critical for the broader collection's thesis. If even revolutionary expropriation that destroyed old oligarchy and redistributed land to 3+ million families proves reversible through legal and economic mechanisms across three generations, then elite power's structural resilience operates beyond any single political disruption. The Mexican case demonstrates that property concentration can be temporarily interrupted but gravitates toward reconcentration when market forces favor large-scale operations, when government withdraws support from small holders, when legal frameworks enable sales, and when international economic integration subordinates national development.

This part documents the 78-year process (1940-2018) by which revolutionary land reform was reversed, showing how PRI's political management prepared for neoliberal counter-revolution, how constitutional reform provided legal framework for reconcentration, and how NAFTA

accelerated peasant displacement creating conditions approaching pre-revolutionary concentration.

I. PRI Management: Undermining Ejidos While Maintaining Control (1940-1982)

The Post-Cárdenas Shift: Ávila Camacho and Industrialization

Manuel Ávila Camacho's presidency (1940-1946) marked explicit shift from agrarian reform to industrial development. The change was immediate and deliberate:

Land redistribution slowed dramatically:

- Cárdenas (1934-1940): 18 million hectares, 800,000 families
- Ávila Camacho (1940-1946): 5.9 million hectares, 157,000 families
- The redistribution rate declined 65-70% immediately after Cárdenas left office

Agricultural policy priorities shifted: Government resources flowed to commercial agriculture in northern states (Sonora, Sinaloa, Baja California). Irrigation projects, credit subsidies, technical assistance, and infrastructure investment favored large private farms. Ejidos received declining support—credit access reduced, technical assistance minimized, infrastructure investment limited.

The ideological justification: Mexico needed industrialization requiring agricultural surplus and foreign exchange. Large commercial farms were "efficient" producers generating exports and feeding urban populations. Ejido subsistence agriculture was "backward" obstacle to development. This efficiency argument naturalized reconcentration as economic necessity.

Why the shift occurred: Post-WWII Mexico prioritized industrial development over social transformation. U.S. pressure during wartime alliance meant protecting American agricultural investments. Mexican business elite opposed further redistribution. New elite forming from revolutionary winners wanted stability for their accumulation. PRI leadership calculated that industrial growth required favoring commercial agriculture over ejidos.

The Mechanisms of Ejido Undermining

Between 1940-1982, PRI governments systematically weakened ejido viability through economic mechanisms while maintaining political control:

Credit discrimination:

Commercial farms received: Subsidized credit at 6-10% interest from government agricultural banks, long-term loans (5-10 years) for equipment and infrastructure, and seasonal credit for inputs guaranteed annually. Large landowners could access 100,000-500,000 peso loans.

Ejidatarios received: Minimal credit from ejidal banks (often insufficient for basic inputs), short-term loans (single season) requiring annual reapplication, interest rates of 10-15%, and bureaucratic requirements many couldn't navigate. Average ejido loans: 2,000-5,000 pesos—barely covering seed and fertilizer.

Result: Commercial farms invested in mechanization, irrigation, improved seeds, and fertilizers. Ejidos lacked capital for improvements. Productivity gaps widened—commercial farms achieved 3-5x higher yields per hectare.

Technical assistance priorities:

Government agricultural extension services concentrated on commercial farming zones. Northern states with large operations received agronomists, veterinarians, and modern techniques. Ejido regions received minimal support. When assistance existed, it promoted techniques requiring capital ejidatarios lacked (chemical fertilizers, hybrid seeds, tractors).

Infrastructure investment:

Major irrigation projects: Built in northern commercial agriculture regions—Sonora, Sinaloa, Baja California. These projects cost hundreds of millions of pesos, transformed arid lands into productive agriculture, and benefited large private landholders disproportionately.

Roads and storage: Commercial agriculture regions received highway connections, storage facilities, and processing infrastructure. Ejido regions had poor roads, inadequate storage, and limited market access—forcing ejidatarios to sell immediately after harvest at lowest prices.

Price policies favoring commercial agriculture:

Government maintained low guaranteed prices for corn and beans (ejido staples) to keep urban food costs down. But provided higher support prices for wheat, cotton, and export crops (commercial farm products). The terms of trade systematically disadvantaged ejido production.

The squeeze on ejidatarios:

Rising costs: Mechanization, chemical inputs, and hybrid seeds became necessary for competitive yields. But ejidatarios couldn't afford them without credit they couldn't access.

Declining prices: Crop prices didn't keep pace with input cost inflation. An ejidatario's corn sold for similar nominal price in 1970 as 1945—while fertilizer, seeds, and tools cost 3-4x more.

Impossible choices: Continue subsistence farming with declining yields and living standards. Rent parcela to commercial operator and work as wage laborer. Abandon ejido and migrate to cities or U.S. illegally.

The numbers document systematic differentiation:

Productivity (tons per hectare, 1970):

- Commercial wheat farms: 3.5-4.5 tons
- Ejido wheat plots: 1.5-2.0 tons
- Commercial corn operations: 3.0-4.0 tons
- Ejido corn plots: 1.0-1.5 tons

Income (pesos annually, 1970):

- Large commercial farmers: 100,000-500,000+
- Medium commercial farmers: 30,000-100,000
- Ejidatarios: 5,000-12,000 (many supplementing with wage labor)

Investment capacity:

- Commercial farms: Tractors, combines, irrigation systems
- Ejidos: Hand tools, occasionally animal traction, minimal mechanization

Illegal Reconcentration Despite Legal Restrictions

Despite constitutional prohibitions on ejido land sales, de facto reconcentration occurred through mechanisms circumventing legal protections:

Rental arrangements: Ejidatarios couldn't legally rent land, but did so informally. Large operators (often former hacienda owners' descendants or new agribusiness) "rented" thousands of hectares from ejidatarios. Contracts were verbal or falsely documented as "partnerships." Ejidatarios received minimal payments while operators captured production value.

False sales: Despite inalienability, sales occurred through: falsified inheritance documents transferring use rights, forged ejido assembly approvals, bribes to agrarian reform officials, and power of attorney agreements giving operators permanent control. The sales were illegal but widespread.

White Guards and violence: In many regions, large landowners employed private militias (guardias blancas) intimidating ejidatarios into "abandoning" lands. Violence, threats, and occasional killings forced ejidatarios from valuable lands near cities or in irrigation zones. Perpetrators were rarely prosecuted—local officials often allied with large landowners.

Narcotrafficking appropriation: Beginning 1970s, drug trafficking organizations began acquiring lands through violence and intimidation. Ejidatarios in strategic zones (Sinaloa,

Chihuahua, Michoacán) faced threats forcing "sales" at minimal prices. By 1980s, cartels controlled hundreds of thousands of hectares.

Urban expansion consuming ejidos: Cities grew onto ejido lands around Mexico City, Guadalajara, Monterrey. Real estate developers purchased ejido parcels despite legal prohibitions—often through corrupt officials or intimidation. Valuable periurban land transferred from ejidatarios to developers at fraction of market value.

PRI's Political Control Through Ejido Dependency

While economically undermining ejidos, PRI used land reform bureaucracy for political control:

The CNC (Confederación Nacional Campesina): PRI created peasant confederation (1938) supposedly representing ejidatarios. Reality: CNC was controlled by PRI leadership, not independent peasant organization. CNC leaders were party appointees, not elected representatives. Dissent meant losing position.

Clientelism and patronage: Access to ejido credit, technical assistance, and government programs required CNC membership and PRI loyalty. Ejidatarios who opposed PRI risked bureaucratic obstacles—loan denials, redistribution delays, infrastructure neglect. The dependency PRI created made opposition costly.

Captive voting bloc: PRI mobilized ejidatarios as guaranteed electoral base. Vote fraud was systematic—CNC organized transportation to polls, monitored voting, and pressured ejidatarios to vote PRI. Between 1940-1988, ejido regions delivered 70-80% margins for PRI. Electoral authoritarianism relied on rural political control.

Demobilization of radical potential: When ejidatarios attempted independent organizing or demanded genuine land redistribution, PRI repressed through: denying organizations legal recognition, imprisoning leaders on fabricated charges, using violence against protests, and co-opting leaders with positions in CNC or government. The 1968 Tlatelolco Massacre and 1970s dirty war killed hundreds of leftist organizers—many from rural movements.

The calculation: PRI maintained ejido system nominally—keeping constitutional commitment to agrarian reform while systematically ensuring ejidos remained economically marginal. This prevented rural radicalization (ejidatarios had land, even if poor) while enabling commercial agriculture dominance. The system served political control, not economic development or social justice.

The Green Revolution: Technology Favoring Large Operations

The Green Revolution (1960s-1970s) introduced high-yield crop varieties, chemical fertilizers, and mechanization. This was presented as progress benefiting all farmers. Reality: it systematically favored large commercial operations:

The technology package required: High-yield seeds needing chemical fertilizers and pesticides, irrigation for consistent water supply, mechanization for large-scale planting/harvesting, and technical knowledge for managing inputs. This package cost thousands of pesos annually per hectare.

Who could adopt: Large commercial farms with credit access, irrigation infrastructure, capital for equipment, and technical expertise. Northern commercial agriculture regions adopted rapidly—productivity doubled or tripled.

Who couldn't adopt: Ejidatarios lacked credit for inputs, irrigation for water needs, capital for tractors and equipment, and often technical training for complex management. Adoption was partial—perhaps using some fertilizer but not full package. Results were minimal productivity gains or losses (fertilizer without water wasted money).

The productivity gap explosion:

1960 (pre-Green Revolution):

- Commercial farms: 2.0-2.5 tons wheat/hectare
- Ejidos: 1.2-1.5 tons wheat/hectare
- Gap: 40-60% higher yields for commercial farms

1980 (post-Green Revolution):

- Commercial farms: 4.0-5.0 tons wheat/hectare
- Ejidos: 1.3-1.8 tons wheat/hectare
- Gap: 150-200%+ higher yields for commercial farms

The technology presented as neutral progress systematically advantaged those with capital and infrastructure. The gap between commercial agriculture and ejidos widened dramatically—making ejido production increasingly uncompetitive and reinforcing narrative that large-scale farming was "efficient" while ejidos were "backward."

II. The Salinas Counter-Revolution: Legalizing Reconcentration (1988-1994)

The PRI Crisis and Neoliberal Turn

By 1988, PRI faced legitimacy crisis. Economic crisis (1982 debt default, 1985-1987 hyperinflation) devastated living standards. Carlos Salinas "won" 1988 election through massive fraud against Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas (Lázaro's son, leading left opposition). International

pressure and domestic protest forced PRI toward political opening. Salinas's response was economic neoliberalism combined with continued political authoritarianism.

The neoliberal program: Privatize state enterprises (banks, telecommunications, steel, etc.), open economy to foreign investment and trade, reduce state regulation and subsidies, implement NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement), and "modernize" agriculture by enabling ejido privatization. The ideology was 1980s Washington Consensus—markets, competition, and private property would generate growth and prosperity.

Article 27 Reform (1992): The Constitutional Counter-Revolution

On January 6, 1992, Salinas announced constitutional reform of Article 27—heart of revolutionary land reform. The changes were presented as "modernizing" ejido system to benefit ejidatarios. Reality: they provided legal framework for reconcentration reversing revolutionary redistribution.

The key changes:

Ended land redistribution: Declared agrarian reform "complete"—no further land would be redistributed regardless of landless peasants remaining. This closed revolutionary era definitively.

Legalized ejido land sales: Removed prohibition on ejido land sales. Ejidatarios could now privatize their parcelas and sell to anyone—including corporations, foreign investors, and large landowners. The inalienability protecting against reconcentration was eliminated.

Ended ejido inalienability: Ejido assemblies could vote to dissolve ejidos entirely, privatize all land, and distribute individual titles. This enabled converting ejidos to private property permanently.

Allowed corporate landholding: Removed prohibition on corporations owning agricultural land (except forests and coastal zones). This enabled agribusiness expansion and foreign agricultural investment.

Increased "small property" limits: Raised limits on "small property" exempt from expropriation—enabling individuals to own 100 hectares irrigated, 200 hectares seasonal, or up to 800 hectares grazing. These "small properties" could reach 2,500 hectares in livestock operations. Elite could accumulate substantial holdings without violating limits.

Recognized existing violations: Granted amnesty to illegal sales, rentals, and concentrations that had occurred 1940-1992. This legalized decades of de facto reconcentration.

The rhetoric vs. reality:

Salinas claimed: Ejidatarios would benefit by gaining ability to sell land, accessing capital through land collateral, attracting investment to improve productivity, and making own decisions about land use. "Freedom" and "opportunity" were emphasized.

The reality: Ejidatarios with valuable land (near cities, good irrigation, high productivity) faced enormous pressure to sell: developers offering cash for periurban lands, agribusiness corporations wanting to consolidate holdings, wealthy individuals seeking investment properties, and narcotrafficking organizations using intimidation and violence. Ejidatarios with poor land had no buyers—freedom to sell meant nothing when land was worthless.

The pressure mechanisms: Ejidatarios were poor—decades of underinvestment ensured this. Many had debts from informal loans. Their children often migrated to cities or U.S. seeing no future in agriculture. When offered 50,000-200,000 pesos ($15,000-60,000 dollars 1992 rates) for land worth 200,000-500,000 pesos, desperate families sold. The "voluntary" sales occurred under economic duress.

The PROCEDE Program: Titling as Dispossession

Salinas implemented PROCEDE (Program for Certification of Ejido Rights) to implement Article 27 reforms. PROCEDE teams visited ejidos nationwide conducting land surveys, issuing individual titles, and facilitating privatization:

The process: PROCEDE officials arrived in ejidos offering to "clarify" land rights and issue formal titles. Ejidatarios could choose: maintain ejido status with individual parcela certificates, or vote to dissolve ejido and receive private property titles. Officials promoted privatization as "modern" choice offering "opportunities."

The pressure: PROCEDE promoted privatization heavily. Officials explained ejidatarios could sell, mortgage, or develop land after privatization. They minimized risks—not emphasizing that once sold, families lost land forever. Many ejidos voted to privatize with limited understanding of implications.

The pace: Between 1992-2006, PROCEDE certified approximately 5 million hectares as privatized. Perhaps 10-15% of ejido lands were fully privatized and titled individually. Much larger percentages remained nominally ejidos but with certified individual parcelas that could be sold with ejido assembly approval—effectively making them marketable.

Who purchased privatized ejido lands:

- Real estate developers: Periurban lands around major cities
- Agribusiness corporations: Consolidating holdings for large-scale operations
- Wealthy individuals: Investment properties and weekend estates
- Foreign investors: Agricultural operations and resort developments
- Narcotrafficking organizations: Strategic territories for drug cultivation or trafficking routes

NAFTA and Agricultural Integration (1994)

NAFTA (January 1, 1994) eliminated tariffs on agricultural products traded between Mexico, U.S., and Canada. This was presented as opening opportunities for Mexican agriculture. Reality: it devastated ejido corn and bean production:

The competition: U.S. corn production was highly mechanized, heavily subsidized (U.S. farmers received $10-20 billion annually in subsidies), and operated at massive scale. U.S. corn costs were 30-40% below Mexican production costs. When tariffs were eliminated, cheap U.S. corn flooded Mexican market.

The impact on ejidatarios: Mexican corn prices collapsed—declining 40-50% in real terms during 1994-2005. Ejidatarios producing 2-4 tons per hectare couldn't compete with subsidized U.S. imports. Traditional corn farming became economically unviable. Options were: abandon corn production and migrate, shift to alternative crops (many lacked infrastructure/expertise), or continue subsistence farming accepting poverty.

The displacement: Estimates suggest 2-3 million rural Mexicans left agriculture during 1994-2010 due to NAFTA impacts. Many migrated to Mexican cities—swelling urban slums. Others crossed to U.S. illegally seeking work. U.S. agricultural subsidies effectively subsidized Mexican rural-urban migration and illegal immigration to U.S.

The beneficiaries: Large Mexican commercial farms producing export vegetables, fruits, and specialty crops for U.S. market. U.S. agribusiness exporting corn to Mexico. Retail corporations (Walmart, etc.) entering Mexican market. The economic integration benefited large-scale commercial operations on both sides while destroying peasant agriculture.

The sovereignty loss: Mexico became dependent on food imports—particularly corn and beans that had been staples produced domestically. By 2010s, Mexico imported 30-40% of corn consumption despite being origin center of corn cultivation. This food dependency gave U.S. economic leverage while eliminating millions of Mexican peasant farmers.

III. The Reconcentration Accelerates (1994-2018)

The Statistics of Reversal

By 2010-2020, property concentration approached Porfirian levels through legal mechanisms:

Land ownership patterns (2007-2020 estimates):

- Top 10% of agricultural producers controlled 60-70% of agricultural land value
- Top 1-3% controlled perhaps 40-50% of productive land
- Land Gini coefficient: 0.76-0.78 (extreme concentration, comparable to 1900-1910)

- Ejidos covered 50-52% of agricultural land nominally but generated only 30-40% of output
- Large commercial operations: 20-30% of land, 60-70% of production value

Ejido land loss mechanisms (1992-2020):

- Formal privatization and sales: Perhaps 10-15% of ejido lands
- Informal long-term rentals to commercial operators: 20-30% of ejido lands effectively controlled by non-ejidatarios
- Abandonment: Perhaps 15-20% of ejido parcelas abandoned as families migrated—often occupied by neighbors or appropriated
- Violence/coercion: Perhaps 5-10% lost to narcotrafficking organizations or other intimidation

Combined impact: Perhaps 50-60% of ejido land has been privatized, rented long-term, abandoned, or coerced from original recipients or their heirs. The ejido system exists legally but much land has returned to concentrated control through various mechanisms.

The New Elite: Who Owns Mexico Now

Agricultural corporations: Mexican and foreign agribusiness companies controlling hundreds of thousands of hectares producing export crops—tomatoes, avocados, berries for U.S. market. These corporations achieved scale and efficiency ejidos couldn't match.

Narcotrafficking organizations: Drug cartels control vast territories—estimates range from hundreds of thousands to millions of hectares across Sinaloa, Chihuahua, Michoacán, Guerrero, and other states. They use land for drug cultivation, trafficking routes, money laundering investments, and territorial control. Violence against ejidatarios is systematic and unprosecuted.

Elite families—new and old: Descendants of revolutionary winners who received land grants in 1920s-1930s have consolidated holdings into substantial operations. Some families with Porfirian-era origins who adapted to post-revolutionary system have reconstituted power. New wealthy families from industry and commerce have purchased agricultural properties as investments.

Foreign investors: Americans, Canadians, and Europeans purchasing Mexican agricultural land for investment or development—particularly coastal areas for tourism and retirement properties. NAFTA and legal reforms enabled this foreign ownership.

The Carlos Slim example: Mexico's wealthiest person (periodic world's wealthiest 2010-2013) traces family origins to Lebanese immigrant who married into Mexican elite in 1902. The family survived revolution, prospered under PRI, and exploded wealth through Salinas privatizations—acquiring Telmex (telecommunications) monopoly worth tens of billions. Slim's

wealth reached $60-70 billion peak—exceeding 5-6% of Mexican GDP. One family controlling more wealth than millions of ejidatarios combined.

Rural Poverty and Violence

The reconcentration's human cost is visible in contemporary statistics:

Rural poverty (2010-2020):

- 50-60% of rural population in poverty (vs. 40-45% urban)
- 20-25% in extreme poverty
- Rural incomes average 40-50% of urban incomes
- Access to services (healthcare, education, sanitation) substantially worse than cities

Agricultural employment collapse:

- 1960: 50-55% of labor force in agriculture
- 1990: 25-28% in agriculture
- 2020: 13-15% in agriculture
- Millions displaced from land without urban employment—creating marginalized populations

The violence pandemic:

- Mexico's "drug war" (2006-present) has killed 150,000-250,000+
- Tens of thousands disappeared
- Much violence is territorial control over drug production/trafficking
- Rural populations face violence from cartels, military, and police
- State's weak presence in rural areas enables cartel territorial control

Migration as response:

- 10-13 million Mexican-born residents in U.S. (2020)
- Substantial portion from rural areas displaced by agricultural transformation
- Remittances from U.S. workers reach $30-40 billion annually—exceeding foreign direct investment
- Rural Mexico's economy partially dependent on exporting labor

---

Conclusion: The 75-Year Reversal

Between 1940-2018, revolutionary land reform that redistributed 47-50% of agricultural land to 3+ million families was systematically reversed through legal and economic mechanisms:

Phase 1 (1940-1982): PRI undermining:

- Redirected support from ejidos to commercial agriculture
- Created productivity gaps through credit/infrastructure discrimination
- Maintained political control while ensuring economic marginalization
- Enabled illegal reconcentration through non-enforcement

Phase 2 (1988-1994): Salinas legalization:

- Article 27 reform removed constitutional protections
- Legalized ejido sales and corporate landholding
- PROCEDE program facilitated privatization
- NAFTA integrated Mexico into U.S. agricultural markets

Phase 3 (1994-2018): Accelerated reconcentration:

- Ejido lands sold, rented, abandoned, or coerced
- Commercial operations and corporations expanded
- Narcotrafficking territorial control
- Property concentration approaching Porfirian levels

The mechanisms were legal and constitutional: No military coup required. No dramatic expropriation. Market mechanisms, policy choices, and legal reforms systematically transferred property from ejidatarios to concentrated owners. The reconcentration occurred through "voluntary" sales under economic duress, legal reforms enabling privatization, and government policy favoring large-scale agriculture.

The comparison to revolutionary redistribution:

1910: 1-2% owned 90-95%, 97% landless **1940:** 47-50% in ejidos, 3M+ families with land **2020:** 1-3% control 60-70% of value, ejidos marginalized

The U-curve is visible: extreme concentration → revolutionary redistribution → systematic reconcentration approaching original levels. Time required: 75 years, three generations. Mechanism: market pressures, legal reforms, and government policy rather than violence.

What this demonstrates for the broader collection:

Even successful revolutionary expropriation that destroyed old oligarchy and redistributed land to millions proves reversible when:

- Market forces favor large-scale operations
- Government withdraws support from small holders
- Legal frameworks enable sales
- International integration makes peasant agriculture unviable
- New elite emerges from revolutionary winners

- Political system uses land reform for control rather than development

Elite power's structural resilience operates across generations even through genuine revolutionary disruption. Property concentration gravitates toward reconcentration through economic mechanisms when political will to prevent it disappears. The Mexican Revolution succeeded temporarily. Elite power reconstituted. The pattern persists.

[End of Part 4 of 5]

Part 5 Preview: *Contemporary Mexico and Pattern Synthesis (2000-2025)* will document democratic transition, drug war violence, MORENA's "Fourth Transformation," track elite family continuity from colonial period to present, analyze why 500 years of "revolutions" preserved concentration, examine structural impossibility of redistribution within existing frameworks, and synthesize implications for understanding elite power globally.

Mexico: Three Centuries of Revolutionary Rhetoric and Elite Continuity

Part 5 of 5: Contemporary Mexico and the Pattern Synthesized (2000-2025)

Introduction: Democracy Without Redistribution

On July 2, 2000, Vicente Fox defeated PRI candidate Francisco Labastida, ending 71 years of PRI rule. International observers celebrated Mexico's "democratic transition." Opposition parties could win. Elections appeared competitive. Freedom House upgraded Mexico's democracy rating. Political scientists proclaimed consolidation.

Property concentration remained unchanged.

Between 2000-2025, Mexico experienced three distinct political regimes: PAN governments (Fox 2000-2006, Calderón 2006-2012) implementing right-wing neoliberalism, PRI return (Peña Nieto 2012-2018) continuing same policies, and MORENA's "Fourth Transformation" (AMLO 2018-2024, Sheinbaum 2024-present) claiming to confront oligarchy. Each used different rhetoric. Each maintained different electoral coalitions. Each claimed to represent "change."

All three preserved the property structures established during colonial period, maintained through independence and Porfiriato, temporarily disrupted by revolution (1910-1940), and systematically reconstituted through PRI management (1940-1982) and neoliberal reforms (1988-2000). Land concentration approaching Porfirian levels survived regime change. Elite families maintained wealth across political transitions. The mechanisms of wealth extraction adapted to democratic forms without fundamental alteration.

This part documents the 25-year period (2000-2025) demonstrating that democratic competition operates within narrow boundaries protecting property. It tracks elite family continuity from colonial origins to present—showing how specific families maintained wealth across 200-500 years of political upheaval. It analyzes why genuine redistribution proves structurally impossible within existing legal and economic frameworks. And it synthesizes 500 years of Mexican history revealing the pattern: revolutionary rhetoric mobilizes popular energy, political institutions change, ideological narratives shift, but property structures persist or reconstitute.

The Mexican case becomes definitive proof that elite power operates independently of particular political regimes, ideological frameworks, or democratic institutions. When all "revolutions"—from independence through MORENA—preserve property concentration, the pattern reveals structural constraints on redistribution itself.

I. The Democratic Transition: PAN Governments (2000-2012)

Vicente Fox (2000-2006): Neoliberalism Without PRI

Fox's victory appeared transformative. PRI's authoritarian control was broken. Private sector businessman (former Coca-Cola executive) would modernize Mexico. U.S.-style democracy and free markets would generate prosperity. International capital praised transition.

The reality: Policy continuity

Economic program: Continued Salinas-Zedillo neoliberalism without modification. Maintained NAFTA framework fully. Privatization proceeded (though major state assets already sold). Labor law favored corporations over unions. Tax policy privileged wealth—Mexico had lowest tax revenue as % GDP in OECD (10-12% vs. 25-35% typical). Free trade expansion including negotiations toward FTAA (Free Trade Area of the Americas).

Agricultural policy: Zero reversal of Article 27 reforms. No ejido support restoration. Continued favoring commercial agriculture. Rural poverty 55-60%—unchanged from Zedillo period. Agricultural employment continued declining (from 20% to 17% during Fox term).

Property concentration: UNCHANGED. Land Gini coefficient remained 0.76-0.78. Ejido land sales/rentals continued. Commercial operations expanded. Narcotrafficking territorial control grew. Fox implemented zero policies addressing concentration.

The political calculation: PAN represented business elite and northern commercial agriculture interests. Fox's constituency benefited from NAFTA and neoliberalism. His campaign rhetoric about "change" meant democratic competition, not economic redistribution. Property protection was non-negotiable—this secured business elite support enabling electoral victory.

The Drug War Begins: Calderón (2006-2012)

Felipe Calderón's 2006 election was contested—losing candidate Andrés Manuel López Obrador (AMLO) claimed fraud after 0.56% margin. Calderón responded by launching "war" against drug cartels in December 2006. This militarization would kill 60,000-120,000 people during his term.

The drug war's origins: Narcotrafficking existed for decades—PRI had managed cartels through corruption and territorial accommodations. Calderón's militarization disrupted arrangements, fragmented cartels, and generated extreme violence. The official justification was fighting organized crime. Reality: militarization served multiple elite interests.

Why militarization occurred:

U.S. pressure: U.S. government demanded Mexico address drug trafficking. Mérida Initiative (2008) provided $3 billion for Mexican military/police. U.S. security establishment wanted militarized approach despite evidence it increases violence.

Legitimacy crisis: Calderón's contested election left him politically weak. Dramatic military action provided nationalist legitimacy and U.S. support.

Elite interests: Drug violence concentrated in rural and poor urban areas. Militarization protected elite properties and commercial interests. Military control over territories enabled resource extraction (mining, energy) without local resistance. Violence justified authoritarian responses to social movements.

The territorial dimension: Cartels controlled vast rural territories—particularly where state presence was historically weak. This included regions with ejidos, indigenous communities, and small farmers. Military operations targeted these areas. The violence displaced populations, facilitated land appropriation, and enabled corporate resource extraction.

The property implications:

- Ejidatarios in conflict zones faced impossible choices: remain and risk violence from cartels/military, or flee abandoning land that was then appropriated
- Violence enabled land concentration as displaced families sold at distressed prices
- Mining and energy companies expanded operations in militarized zones—military presence suppressed resistance
- Foreign investors favored commercial properties in "secure" zones—accelerating concentration

Statistics documenting violence:

- 60,000-120,000 killed during Calderón term (estimates vary)
- 25,000+ disappeared
- 300,000+ displaced from homes (internal refugees)
- Violence concentrated in: Chihuahua, Sinaloa, Guerrero, Michoacán, Tamaulipas
- Rural areas disproportionately affected

The economic continuity: Despite violence crisis, economic policy remained unchanged. NAFTA continued. Privatization proceeded. Tax policy favored wealth. Labor law weakened unions. Property concentration increased. Agricultural policy continued favoring commercial operations. Rural poverty remained 55-60%.

The 2008 financial crisis: Global recession reduced remittances from U.S. (rural families' income source), decreased agricultural exports, increased unemployment. Yet Calderón implemented no redistribution—maintained neoliberal framework despite crisis demonstrating market vulnerabilities.

II. PRI Return: Peña Nieto (2012-2018)

The PRI Restoration

PRI returned to presidency in 2012 with Enrique Peña Nieto—young, telegenic candidate representing "new PRI" supposedly reformed from authoritarian past. International media celebrated Mexico's "democratic maturity"—power alternating peacefully between parties. Reality: same elite coalition implementing same policies regardless of party label.

The Pact for Mexico (2012-2013): Peña Nieto negotiated "reforms" with PAN and PRD (center-left) creating appearance of consensus. The reforms: education (weakening teachers' union), telecommunications (partial opening to competition), financial sector (banking regulation), and critically—energy sector.

The Energy Reform (2013-2014): Partial Oil Privatization

Peña Nieto's signature achievement was constitutional reform of Article 27 (again) enabling private investment in oil and gas extraction. This reversed Cárdenas's 1938 nationalization partially.

The constitutional change: Modified Article 27 and created new Hydrocarbons Law allowing: private companies to explore/extract oil and gas, production-sharing contracts giving companies percentage of output, foreign investment in energy sector, and Pemex (state oil company) competing with private firms.

The justification: Pemex needed investment to maintain production. Private sector efficiency would increase output. Mexico could benefit from shale oil/gas technology. Nationalization had failed—production declining despite high oil prices 2000-2014.

The reality: Oil prices collapsed 2014-2016 (from $100+ to $30-40/barrel) making new investments uneconomic. Private companies showed limited interest. Production continued declining. Pemex remained dominant but weakened by debt and corruption. The reform's primary achievement was ideological—demonstrating even revolutionary sacred cows (oil nationalization) could be reversed.

The property parallel: Just as Article 27 reform (1992) enabled reversing land reform, energy reform (2013-2014) enabled reversing oil nationalization. The pattern is identical: revolutionary expropriations prove reversible through constitutional "modernization" when elite consensus supports reversal and popular resistance is manageable.

Rural Violence Acceleration

Violence increased during Peña Nieto term despite promises to reduce it:

Death toll: 150,000-200,000+ killed during term (worse than Calderón)
Disappeared: 30,000+ additional disappearances
Cartel territorial control: Expanded in Guerrero, Michoacán, Jalisco, Veracruz, and elsewhere

The Ayotzinapa Case (September 26, 2014): 43 students from rural teachers' college in Guerrero were disappeared by municipal police and military in coordination with cartels. The students were from poor rural families—future teachers for marginalized communities. Their disappearance became international scandal. Despite promises, government never provided accountability. Truth commission (2022) concluded military participated in disappearance and murders.

Why Ayotzinapa matters: Rural teachers' colleges (normales rurales) have historically organized peasant and indigenous communities, supported land struggles, and promoted social movements. The violence against Ayotzinapa students sent message: organizing rural poor invites lethal response. The case demonstrates state violence protecting elite interests against potential rural mobilization.

The broader rural violence: Journalists, activists, and community leaders murdered systematically. 2012-2018 saw: 50+ journalists killed, 100+ environmental/land defenders killed, Indigenous community organizers targeted. This violence suppressed potential resistance to land appropriation, mining/energy extraction, and agricultural displacement.

Continued Reconcentration

Property concentration accelerated under Peña Nieto:

Agricultural concentration (2010-2018):

- Land Gini coefficient: 0.76-0.78 (stable extreme concentration)
- Top 10% controlled 65-70% of agricultural land value
- Top 1-3% controlled approximately 50% of productive land
- Ejido land continued transferring through sales, rentals, and abandonment

Corporate agriculture expansion: Agribusiness operations producing export crops (avocados, berries, tomatoes) expanded dramatically. Foreign investment in agriculture increased. U.S. and Canadian companies acquired substantial holdings. Corporate farms achieved efficiencies ejidos couldn't match—further marginalizing peasant agriculture.

Urban real estate concentration: Mexico City, Monterrey, Guadalajara real estate became investment vehicles for domestic elite and foreign capital. Gentrification displaced poor residents. Real estate speculation drove prices beyond middle-class reach. Housing became wealth storage rather than shelter.

Elite wealth concentration: Carlos Slim remained wealthiest person in Mexico (wealth fluctuating $40-70 billion depending on markets). Top 10% owned 64% of wealth. Top 1%

owned 43% of wealth. Wealth Gini coefficient 0.80+ (extreme concentration globally). Despite PRI rhetoric about reducing inequality, concentration increased or remained stable.

The development failure: GDP growth averaged 2.5-3% annually 2012-2018—barely above population growth. Real wages stagnant or declining. Poverty rates stable at 43-46%. Extreme poverty 7-9%. The neoliberal model generated elite wealth but not broad prosperity. Two decades of NAFTA integration and neoliberal reforms had failed to generate sustained development benefiting majority.

III. MORENA and the "Fourth Transformation" (2018-2025)

AMLO's Landslide Victory (2018)

Andrés Manuel López Obrador won presidency in landslide—53% of vote, largest margin in modern Mexican history. His party MORENA (Movimiento Regeneración Nacional) swept Congress. It appeared transformative: outsider challenging oligarchy, massive popular support, congressional majority enabling reforms.

The revolutionary rhetoric: AMLO declared "Fourth Transformation"—comparable to: Independence (1810-1821), Reform (1855-1876), Revolution (1910-1940). He claimed to represent poor against oligarchy. His slogan: "For the good of all, the poor first" (Por el bien de todos, primero los pobres). He attacked "neoliberal" period (1982-2018) as disaster. He promised to confront concentrated wealth and power.

The mandate: 53% vote share and congressional majorities gave AMLO unprecedented power—more than any president since PRI's authoritarian peak. If genuine redistribution were ever possible through democratic means, AMLO had the political strength to attempt it.

What AMLO did: Implemented significant flow benefits, maintained confrontational rhetoric against elites, generated high approval ratings (60-70% through 2022). What AMLO did NOT do: touch property structures, implement wealth taxes, reverse neoliberal legal frameworks, or redistribute land.

The Flow Benefits: Real but Reversible

AMLO's programs provided real improvements for poor Mexicans:

Cash transfers expanded dramatically:

- Universal pension for elderly (65+): 3,850 pesos monthly (~$200)
- Youth apprentice program: 3,600 pesos monthly stipend
- Scholarships for students from poor families
- Disability assistance

- Programs reached 10+ million beneficiaries

Minimum wage increases: Real minimum wage increased approximately 80% during 2018-2024—from 88 pesos daily (2018) to 248 pesos daily (2024). In real purchasing power, this represented 40-50% increase above inflation—substantial improvement reversing decades of decline.

Infrastructure projects:

- Tren Maya (rail network across southern Mexico)
- Dos Bocas oil refinery (returning to oil self-sufficiency)
- AIFA airport (replacing cancelled Mexico City airport)
- Projects employed hundreds of thousands, generated regional development

Healthcare expansion: Attempted universal healthcare (IMSS-Bienestar) replacing Seguro Popular. Implementation faced challenges but intention was expanding coverage.

The impact: These programs reduced extreme poverty from 7-9% to 5-7%. Elderly poverty declined significantly. Working-class purchasing power improved. Rural areas received more federal attention. Approval ratings reflected genuine improvement in living standards for poorest Mexicans.

Why this mattered—and why it wasn't enough: These were flow benefits—income transfers improving consumption without changing property ownership. Cash transfers are reversible—future governments can eliminate them immediately. Minimum wage increases help workers but don't transfer ownership. Infrastructure projects employ temporarily but don't redistribute wealth permanently.

Compare to revolutionary land reform (1920s-1940s): ejido grants were stock transfers—families received property ownership (even if limited by inalienability). AMLO's programs gave purchasing power, not property. This is the critical distinction the framework emphasizes.

The Property Silence: What AMLO Protected

Despite revolutionary rhetoric and confrontational stance toward "oligarchy," AMLO implemented ZERO policies redistributing property:

Land reform: NONE. No reversal of Article 27 reforms. No ejido support restoration. No land redistribution to landless peasants. Agricultural policy continued favoring commercial operations. Rural poverty remained 50-55%—improved slightly but fundamentally unchanged.

Wealth taxation: NONE. Mexico's tax revenue remained 10-12% of GDP (lowest in OECD). No wealth taxes implemented despite extreme concentration. No inheritance tax increases. No property taxes on large landholdings. Elite retained wealth accumulation mechanisms.

Corporate regulation: Minimal. Some monopoly prosecution (particularly telecommunications) but mostly symbolic. Corporations maintained dominant positions. No nationalization of concentrated industries. Energy reform (2013-2014) NOT reversed despite campaign promises to review it.

Labor law: No fundamental changes. Workers gained some bargaining rights improvements, but overall labor law continued favoring capital. Union independence increased but capital's structural power unchanged.

NAFTA/USMCA: Renegotiated as USMCA (2018-2020) with minor modifications—primarily benefiting U.S. auto industry. Fundamental free trade framework maintained. Agricultural integration continued. No return to protectionism or national development strategy.

Financial wealth: Absolutely protected. No capital controls. No restrictions on capital flight. Wealthy could move money abroad freely. Banking sector consolidated further—concentration increased. Elite financial wealth secure.

Urban property: No rent controls. No housing socialization. No restrictions on speculation. Real estate continued as wealth storage vehicle. Gentrification accelerated in Mexico City and other major cities.

The examples documenting protection:

Carlos Slim: Maintained telecommunications near-monopoly. Wealth fluctuated with markets but remained $40-60 billion. AMLO criticized Slim rhetorically but implemented no policies reducing his power. América Móvil, Telmex, other Slim holdings faced no nationalization threats.

Other billionaires: Mexico had 12-15 billionaires throughout AMLO term—number stable or increased. Their wealth primarily in: retail (Walmart Mexico, Soriana, etc.), finance (Banamex, BBVA Bancomer, etc.), mining (Peñoles, others), media (Televisa, TV Azteca), and commerce. None faced expropriation or serious regulatory threats.

Foreign corporations: Maintained operations without nationalization. U.S., Canadian, European, and Asian corporations operating in Mexico faced no fundamental changes. Some mines faced environmental reviews but overall foreign investment protected.

Land concentration: Continued. Ejido sales/rentals proceeded. Commercial agriculture expanded. Narcotrafficking territorial control stable or increased. Gini coefficient remained 0.76-0.78. By 2024, property concentration statistics were statistically unchanged from 2018.

The Elite Unity on Property

Despite AMLO's confrontational rhetoric attacking "oligarchy," "fifís" (Mexican slang for wealthy snobs), and "conservatives," elite unity on property protection held:

Business organizations opposed AMLO's style but not property policies: COPARMEX (employers' federation), CCE (business coordinating council), and other business groups criticized AMLO's infrastructure priorities, energy policy details, and regulatory approaches. But they never faced genuine expropriation threats. Their criticism was about policy specifics, not fundamental challenges to wealth.

Media opposition: Televisa, TV Azteca, and major newspapers opposed AMLO consistently. But they operated freely—no nationalization, no censorship (despite AMLO's complaints), no regulatory threats to licenses. Media oligopolies remained intact.

PAN and PRI opposition: Opposition parties attacked AMLO's "authoritarianism," fiscal irresponsibility, and policy failures. But they never attacked his failure to redistribute property—because they opposed redistribution more fundamentally. The elite consensus protecting property crossed party lines.

The calculation: Elite tolerated AMLO's cash transfers and minimum wage increases because: (1) they were affordable—cost 2-3% of GDP, easily financed by oil revenue and economic growth, (2) they increased consumption benefiting retail/commerce, (3) they didn't threaten property ownership, (4) they were reversible—future governments could eliminate them.

Elite would have united against genuine redistribution—land reform, wealth taxation, nationalization. AMLO never tested this because he never attempted it. His "confrontation" with oligarchy was rhetorical theater while property structures remained protected.

Why AMLO Didn't Redistribute

The critical question: Why didn't leader with revolutionary rhetoric, massive mandate, and congressional majority implement genuine redistribution? Several factors:

Ideological limitations: AMLO's ideology was nationalist developmentalism, not socialism. He criticized neoliberal inequality but believed state-led capitalism could generate broad prosperity. He wanted poverty reduction through growth and redistribution of growth benefits—not expropriation of concentrated wealth.

Political constraints: Business elite could have crashed economy through capital flight, investment strike, and financial panic. U.S. government would have opposed nationalization or expropriation threatening American investments. Military might have intervened if property threatened fundamentally (Mexican military has business interests and elite connections). International financial institutions (IMF, World Bank) would have imposed costs.

Legal frameworks: Mexican constitution protects private property. Expropriation requires compensation at fair market value. Changing legal frameworks requires constitutional amendments—possible with MORENA majorities but facing institutional resistance. International trade agreements (USMCA, investment treaties) provide corporate legal weapons against expropriation.

Economic integration: NAFTA/USMCA integration makes autarkic development impossible. Mexican economy depends on U.S. trade, foreign investment, and transnational supply chains. Attempting redistribution threatens this integration—risking economic collapse.

Lack of organized pressure: Unlike 1910-1920 revolution when armed peasant armies (Zapatistas, Villistas) fought for land redistribution, AMLO faced no comparable popular pressure. Electoral support doesn't generate same revolutionary force as armed mobilization. Voters wanted consumption improvements, not property transformation.

Personal trajectory: AMLO came from middle-class background, governed two states within PRI system, built political career through institutional means. Despite rhetoric, he represented institutional left working within system—not revolutionary outside challenging foundations.

The synthesis: AMLO represents what's possible within existing frameworks—flow benefits improving living standards without threatening property. This is "maximum feasible reform" that elite tolerates because it preserves their fundamental interests. Anything beyond this requires force that democratic left lacks and won't mobilize.

Claudia Sheinbaum (2024-present): Continuity

MORENA's Claudia Sheinbaum won 2024 election with 59% (even larger than AMLO), becoming Mexico's first female president and first Jewish president. Sheinbaum continued AMLO's programs:

Policy continuity: Cash transfers maintained, minimum wage increases continued, infrastructure completion (Tren Maya, etc.), rhetorical confrontation with oligarchy continued, property protection continued.

Early indications (2024-2025): No land reform. No wealth taxation. No fundamental challenge to concentration. Same patterns as AMLO—flow benefits with stock protection. Elite wealth secure. Property concentration stable.

The pattern extends: MORENA's "Fourth Transformation" operates within same boundaries as all previous Mexican "revolutions"—political change, institutional reform, ideological shift, flow benefits to popular classes, but property structures protected absolutely.

IV. Elite Family Continuity: 200-500 Years of Wealth Transmission

Tracking Specific Families Across Centuries

One of the collection's critical demonstrations is showing how specific elite families maintain wealth across centuries of political upheaval. Mexico provides examples traceable 200-500 years:

The Slim Family: Five Generations of Elite Adaptation

Generation 1 (1902-1920s): Julián Slim Haddad immigrated from Lebanon to Mexico (1902), married Linda Helú (daughter of Lebanese immigrants integrated into Mexican elite). Established retail business in Mexico City during late Porfiriato. Business survived revolution—family adapted to new regime.

Generation 2 (1920s-1960s): Julián Slim Helú (Carlos Slim's father) expanded business during PRI era. Acquired real estate, invested in mining and commerce. Built substantial fortune—not oligarch level but wealthy merchant class.

Generation 3 (1960s-1990s): Carlos Slim Helú inherited father's business (1950s), expanded during PRI era through: real estate investments, industrial holdings, financial investments. Key breakthrough: Salinas privatizations (1990-1994) when Slim acquired Telmex (telecommunications monopoly) for approximately $1 billion—far below market value. Privatization transfer made Slim billionaire.

Generation 4-5 (1990s-present): Slim's wealth exploded from Telmex monopoly—telecommunications company worth $40-70 billion depending on markets. Diversified into retail (Sears, Sanborns), finance, mining, construction, real estate. By 2010-2013, wealthiest person in world ($60-75 billion). Sons Carlos, Marco Antonio, and Patrick Slim inherited and manage empire—continuing to sixth generation.

The trajectory: Immigrant arriving during Porfiriato → merchant wealth during Revolution/PRI → billionaire through privatization → global oligarch. Five generations, multiple regime changes, wealth consistently growing. Key moment was capturing state asset during privatization—classic mechanism for converting political connections to property.

Families with Porfirian-Era Origins

The Azcárraga Family (Media):

Origins: Family established wealth during Porfiriato in northern Mexico. Connected to revolutionary winners maintaining position.

Evolution: Emilio Azcárraga Vidaurreta founded radio empire (1930s-1940s). Son Emilio Azcárraga Milmo expanded to television—created Televisa (largest Spanish-language media company globally). Grandson Emilio Azcárraga Jean currently controls Televisa.

Current wealth: Televisa worth several billion dollars. Family maintains media monopoly across Mexico/Latin America. Political influence through media control enables shaping public discourse and protecting interests.

The Baillères Family (Mining, Retail, Finance):

Origins: Traceable to Porfirian elite in mining sector. Family survived revolution maintaining mining concessions.

Evolution: Alberto Baillères González expanded into retail (Palacio de Hierro department stores) and finance. Son Alberto Baillères Gonzélez inherited and expanded empire.

Current holdings: Grupo Bal controlling mining (Peñoles, one of world's largest silver producers), retail, insurance. Family worth $8-12 billion. Four generations maintaining wealth through regime changes.

The Servitje Family (Food Production):

Origins: Spanish immigrant Lorenzo Servitje Sendra arrived early 20th century. Family established bakery during post-revolutionary period.

Evolution: Founded Grupo Bimbo (1945)—bread and baked goods company. Expanded during PRI era becoming dominant national brand. Roberto Servitje Sendra led expansion making Bimbo largest baking company in world.

Current status: Bimbo operates across Americas, Europe, Asia. Revenue $15+ billion annually. Family worth several billion dollars. Three generations building and maintaining empire.

Revolutionary Winners Becoming New Elite

The Ávila Camacho Family:

Manuel Ávila Camacho (president 1940-1946) and brother Maximino Ávila Camacho (Puebla governor) used political power to acquire: large landholdings in Puebla, industrial investments, urban real estate. Descendant families maintained wealth through PRI era and beyond—becoming part of regional elite.

The Alemán Family:

Miguel Alemán Valdés (president 1946-1952) acquired vast holdings during term: Acapulco real estate (prime coastal development), tourism investments, construction companies, media holdings. Son Miguel Alemán Velasco continued empire—Interjet airline, tourism, real estate. Wealth transmitted across three generations from revolutionary political power to oligarchic holdings.

The pattern: Revolutionary military officers and early PRI leaders used political power to acquire property—land grants, business concessions, urban real estate, industrial holdings. Their descendants became third-generation elite indistinguishable from families with Porfirian origins. Property was transmitted across generations despite revolutionary origins.

Narcotrafficking as New Elite Formation

Drug trafficking organizations represent new wealth formation mechanism—outside traditional channels but following similar patterns:

The scale: Major cartels (Sinaloa, CJNG, Gulf, Zetas, others) generate revenue estimated $20-40 billion annually from U.S./Mexican drug markets. This wealth seeks investment and legitimization.

Property acquisition: Cartels acquire: agricultural land (hundreds of thousands of hectares), urban real estate, legitimate businesses (restaurants, stores, construction), financial investments. Purchases use violence, intimidation, and money laundering.

Generational transmission: Second and third generation cartel families increasingly legitimate—investing in legal businesses, educating children in elite schools, integrating into upper class. Pattern resembles 19th century U.S. robber barons whose descendants became respectable elite.

The implications: New wealth formation mechanism (narcotrafficking) follows same pattern as old mechanisms (colonial land grants, revolutionary military power, PRI political connections, Salinas privatizations). Violence and illegality enable initial accumulation. Then wealth transmits across generations becoming legitimate property. Mechanism changes but pattern persists.

The Synthesis: Elite Circulation vs. Elite Persistence

Mexican history shows both elite circulation (old families destroyed, new families rising) and elite persistence (some families maintaining wealth 200-500 years). The pattern:

Continuity: Baillères family (mining since Porfiriato), Azcárraga family (media across 100+ years), Slim family (five generations rising and maintaining). Property structures enable transmission despite political upheaval.

Circulation: Porfirian oligarchy largely destroyed 1910-1920. Revolutionary winners formed new elite. Salinas-era beneficiaries (like Slim) created new fortunes. Narcotrafficking creates new wealth. Old elite destroyed but replaced by new elite maintaining similar concentration.

The critical insight: Whether specific families persist or new families replace them, property concentration persists. Elite circulation doesn't reduce concentration—it changes names on title while maintaining structure. The Mexican Revolution destroyed families owning 90-95% of land in 1910. By 2025, different families own similar percentage. Pattern survived even though families didn't.

This demonstrates collection's thesis: elite power is structural, not personal. Specific elite are replaceable. Property concentration mechanisms persist across elite circulation. This is why revolution can destroy particular oligarchs without preventing oligarchy's reconstitution.

V. Why 500 Years of "Revolutions" Failed

The Seven Mexican "Revolutions" and Property

Mexico experienced seven major political transformations between 1521-2025 that elites or historians called "revolutions":

1. Spanish Conquest (1519-1521): Complete property transformation—indigenous collective ownership replaced by Spanish private property and monarchy. Indigenous peoples lost everything. 96% population decline through genocide, disease, and forced labor. But this established property concentration template that persisted.

2. Independence (1810-1821): Political sovereignty changed (Spanish Crown to Mexican republic). Indigenous and mestizo peasants mobilized expecting land. Property unchanged—Creole elite who captured independence protected hacienda system. Hidalgo and Morelos (leaders promising redistribution) executed.

3. Liberal Reform (1855-1876): Church property expropriated, indigenous communal lands forced into market, individual property rights established. This was called "modernization" and "progress." Reality: accelerated concentration—elites purchased church lands and indigenous territories. Peasants lost additional 40-50% of remaining communal holdings.

4. Porfiriato (1876-1910): Not called "revolution" but claimed to be "progress" and "modernization" through science and development. Survey laws transferred 50 million hectares indigenous lands to elite. Concentration reached 90-95%—worst in Mexican history. 97% of rural families landless by 1910.

5. Mexican Revolution (1910-1940): Only successful redistribution. Hacienda oligarchy destroyed. 47-50% of land redistributed to 3+ million families through ejido system. 1-2 million dead. Zapata and Villa (genuine redistributionist leaders) assassinated after revolution succeeded but before implementing full program.

6. Neoliberal "Modernization" (1982-2000): Salinas called it "modernization." Economic liberalization, privatization, NAFTA, Article 27 reform enabling ejido sales. This was counter-revolution reversing 1910-1940 redistribution through legal mechanisms and market forces.

7. MORENA's "Fourth Transformation" (2018-present): AMLO and Sheinbaum claiming transformation comparable to Independence, Reform, Revolution. Flow benefits real but property untouched. Continues pattern of revolutionary rhetoric protecting concentration.

The Pattern Across All Seven

What changed: Political sovereignty (1810-1821), ideological frameworks (Liberal Reform established individual property rights), regime form (Porfiriato dictatorship → Revolution → PRI authoritarianism → Democracy), religious power (Reform secularized), foreign ownership (Revolution nationalized oil/railways, later partially reversed), labor law (Revolution gave workers formal rights), political competition (Democracy enabled opposition parties).

What didn't change: Property concentration. Whether owned by Spanish encomenderos (1521-1810), Creole oligarchs (1810-1910), PRI-connected elite (1940-2000), or contemporary billionaires (2000-2025)—concentration persists. The names change. The mechanisms adapt. The structure persists.

The only exception—and its reversal: Mexican Revolution (1910-1940) achieved genuine redistribution. This proves transformation is possible—not structurally impossible. But redistribution was reversed within 75 years through legal reforms and market mechanisms. This proves redistribution must be defended permanently or reconcentration occurs.

Why Redistribution Proves Structurally Impossible Within Existing Frameworks

The Mexican case demonstrates structural constraints making genuine redistribution impossible through democratic/constitutional means:

Legal frameworks protect property:

- Constitution guarantees private property rights
- Expropriation requires "fair market value" compensation—making large-scale redistribution prohibitively expensive
- International trade agreements (USMCA, investment treaties) enable corporate legal challenges to expropriation
- Constitutional reform requires supermajorities—achievable but facing institutional resistance
- Supreme Court can block reforms as unconstitutional

Economic integration creates constraints:

- NAFTA/USMCA integration makes autarkic development impossible
- Capital flight threat disciplines policy—radical redistribution triggers financial panic
- Foreign investment withdrawal threat limits policy options
- International financial institutions (IMF, World Bank) impose conditions preventing redistribution
- Transnational supply chains mean production dependent on global capital

Elite power operates beyond electoral democracy:

- Business elite control investment—can strike if threatened

- Media oligopolies shape public discourse
- Financial sector can crash economy through panic
- Military has elite connections and business interests
- U.S. government intervenes against redistribution threatening American interests
- International capital coordinates against expropriation

Market mechanisms favor concentration:

- Large-scale operations achieve economies of scale small holders can't match
- Capital accumulation creates competitive advantages
- Credit markets favor large borrowers over small
- Technological requirements favor capital-intensive operations
- Global competition makes peasant agriculture unviable
- Property concentration gravitates toward equilibrium favoring large holdings

Political calculations limit reformers:

- Leaders working within system (like AMLO) depend on elite tolerance
- Revolutionary transformation requires force that democratic left lacks
- Electoral coalitions are fragile—redistributing property alienates middle-class supporters
- International legitimacy requires respecting property rights
- Economic disruption from radical reform creates political vulnerability

The synthesis: Even leaders with genuine intent to redistribute (like Cárdenas 1934-1940) face structural limits. Cárdenas succeeded because: post-revolutionary military victory destroyed old elite's armed power, revolutionary ideology was hegemonic, U.S. accepted reform (Good Neighbor policy), and PRI consolidation needed peasant base. When these conditions disappeared (post-1940), reconcentration became possible.

Contemporary leaders like AMLO face tighter constraints: economic integration, constitutional property protections, elite unity on property, lack of revolutionary military force, international capital mobility, and electoral democracy requiring elite tolerance. The structural space for redistribution has narrowed since 1930s.

This explains why every Mexican "revolution" preserves property: reforms that would genuinely redistribute wealth trigger elite collective action (capital flight, investment strikes, media campaigns, potential coups) that democratic leaders cannot withstand. The boundary of "acceptable" reform is flow benefits improving consumption without threatening ownership. AMLO maximized flow benefits while respecting this boundary. Going beyond requires revolutionary force—which Mexico had 1910-1920 but lacks now.

VI. Contemporary Property Concentration Statistics (2020-2025)

Agricultural Land Ownership

Current concentration (2020-2024):

- Land Gini coefficient: 0.76-0.78 (extreme concentration)
- Top 10% control approximately 65-70% of agricultural land value
- Top 1-3% control approximately 50% of productive agricultural land
- Large commercial operations (>100 hectares): 1-2% of farms, 50-60% of output
- Medium operations (20-100 hectares): 8-10% of farms, 25-30% of output
- Small holdings (<20 hectares): 88-90% of farms, 15-20% of output

Ejido status:

- Ejidos cover 50-52% of agricultural land nominally (105-108 million hectares)
- But ejido productivity: 30-40% of agricultural output
- Effective control through rentals/sales: 40-50% of ejido land no longer controlled by original recipients or heirs
- Ejidatario income: Average 30,000-50,000 pesos annually ($1,500-2,500 USD)—far below national average

The comparison to Porfiriato:

- 1910: 1-2% owned 90-95%, 97% of rural families landless
- 1940: 47-50% redistributed to ejidos
- 2025: 1-3% control 60-70% of value, effective reconcentration approaching 1910 levels

The U-curve is complete: high concentration → redistribution → reconcentration. 115 years (1910-2025) returned to similar concentration as starting point. Revolutionary redistribution was temporary interruption in long-term concentration pattern.

Urban Property and Wealth

Real estate concentration:

- Major cities (Mexico City, Monterrey, Guadalajara): Properties increasingly owned by: domestic elite, foreign investors, real estate investment trusts (REITs), pension funds, private equity
- Gentrification accelerating: Historic centers, trendy neighborhoods becoming unaffordable
- Median home price to median income ratio: 8-12x in major cities (international standard 3-5x for affordability)

- Rental markets: 40-50% of urban families rent—often paying 40-50%+ of income

Overall wealth concentration (2020-2024):

- Top 10% own 64-66% of total wealth
- Top 1% own 43-45% of total wealth
- Wealth Gini coefficient: 0.80-0.83 (among highest globally)
- Billionaires: 12-15 individuals worth $80-120 billion combined (approximately 5-7% of GDP)
- Carlos Slim alone: $40-70 billion depending on market conditions (3-5% of GDP)

Income inequality:

- Income Gini coefficient: 0.45-0.48 (high but not extreme by Latin American standards)
- Top 10% earn 40-42% of national income
- Bottom 50% earn 12-15% of national income
- Wage share of GDP: 28-30% (low—indicates capital captures large share)

Poverty Amidst Concentration

Current poverty rates (2024):

- Poverty (income below basic needs): 43-46% of population
- Extreme poverty (income below food needs): 5-7% of population
- Rural poverty: 50-55%
- Urban poverty: 40-42%
- Indigenous poverty: 65-70%

The contrast: Mexico has 12-15 billionaires worth $80-120 billion while 50+ million people live in poverty and 6-8 million in extreme poverty. One person (Carlos Slim) has wealth equivalent to 3-5% of national GDP while half the population lacks basic needs. This extreme inequality coexists with formal democracy—demonstrating democracy doesn't prevent or reverse concentration.

Comparative Context

Mexico vs. Other Latin American Countries (Land Gini):

- Mexico: 0.76-0.78
- Brazil: 0.85-0.87 (worse than Mexico)
- Colombia: 0.86-0.88 (worse)
- Argentina: 0.83-0.85 (worse)
- Chile: 0.78-0.80 (similar)
- Uruguay: 0.74-0.76 (similar)

Mexico's concentration is severe but not worst in Latin America—region has world's highest land concentration generally. What makes Mexico unique is NOT concentration level but the fact it HAD successful redistribution (1920s-1940s) that was reversed. Other countries never achieved redistribution to reverse.

Mexico vs. OECD Countries (Wealth Gini):

- Mexico: 0.80-0.83
- U.S.: 0.85-0.87 (worse than Mexico)
- France: 0.70-0.72
- Germany: 0.74-0.76
- Nordic countries: 0.65-0.70
- Japan: 0.63-0.65

Mexico's wealth concentration exceeds most developed countries except U.S. This reflects Latin American colonial legacy but also demonstrates neoliberalism's global tendency toward concentration.

VII. The Synthesis: What Mexico Teaches

Elite Power Operates Beyond Political Regimes

The Mexican case demonstrates elite power persists across radical political changes:

Regimes Mexico experienced: Spanish colonial absolutism (1521-1810), conservative monarchy attempts (1820s, 1860s), liberal republicanism (1855-1876), Porfirian dictatorship (1876-1910), revolutionary transformation (1910-1920), PRI authoritarianism (1929-2000), democratic competition (2000-present), and leftist populism (2018-present).

What persisted across all regimes: Property concentration. The mechanisms adapted. The ideological justifications changed. The legal frameworks evolved. But concentration persisted or reconstituted.

The implication: Elite power is structural, not dependent on particular regime form. Dictatorship, democracy, revolutionary transformation, market authoritarianism—all can serve property concentration if legal and economic frameworks enable it. Regime change is insufficient for redistribution.

Revolutionary Expropriation Can Be Reversed

Mexico proves that even genuine revolutionary redistribution destroying old elite and redistributing property proves reversible:

What happened 1910-1940: Hacienda oligarchy destroyed, 47-50% of land redistributed to 3+ million families, revolutionary legal framework established, new institutions created (ejido system), and constitutional protections implemented.

What happened 1940-2020: PRI undermined ejido viability economically while maintaining political control, Salinas reformed constitution removing protections, NAFTA integrated Mexico into U.S.-dominated markets making peasant agriculture unviable, and property reconcentrated through legal sales and market mechanisms.

The timeline: 75 years (1940-2015) to reverse redistribution substantially. Three generations. The mechanism was legal reform plus market pressure—not coup or violent expropriation.

The lesson: Redistributing property once is insufficient. Redistribution must be defended permanently or market forces and elite legal strategies reconcentrate property. This requires constant political mobilization maintaining redistribution as priority. When mobilization ends (as post-1940 when revolutionary generation died), reversal begins.

Flow Benefits Cannot Substitute for Stock Transformation

The collection's framework distinguishes flow (income, consumption benefits) from stock (property ownership). Mexico demonstrates why this distinction matters:

Flow benefits under AMLO (2018-2024):

- Cash transfers to elderly, students, disabled
- Minimum wage increases (40-50% real gains)
- Infrastructure employment
- Healthcare expansion
- These improved living standards materially and measurably

What didn't change:

- Property ownership concentration
- Wealth distribution
- Capital accumulation mechanisms
- Elite family continuity
- Long-term power structures

Why flow benefits are insufficient: They improve consumption temporarily but are reversible. Future governments can eliminate transfers, reduce wages (through inflation or policy), and end programs. Benefits last only as long as political will maintains them. They don't transform power relations—elite still own productive property generating wealth across generations.

Stock transformation would mean: Redistributing land ownership, nationalizing concentrated industries, implementing wealth taxes preventing accumulation, creating worker ownership of

enterprises, and establishing permanent legal frameworks preventing reconcentration. This transforms who owns society's productive assets—changing power relations fundamentally.

The Mexican pattern: Every "revolution" provided flow benefits (wage increases, social programs, infrastructure) while protecting stock (property ownership). This pattern defines boundary of acceptable reform within existing frameworks. AMLO maximized flow benefits. But staying within acceptable boundaries meant protecting stock.

Market Mechanisms Favor Concentration

Mexico demonstrates how market forces favor large-scale property accumulation:

Agricultural concentration mechanisms:

- Large operations achieve economies of scale
- Capital-intensive technology requires resources small holders lack
- Credit markets favor large borrowers
- Infrastructure investment follows commercial operations
- Export markets demand scale and consistency
- Global competition makes subsistence agriculture unviable

The ejido failure: Ejidos couldn't compete with commercial operations because: insufficient capital for technology, inadequate credit access, poor infrastructure, unfavorable terms of trade, and NAFTA competition from subsidized U.S. agriculture. Market pressures forced: land sales to commercial operators, long-term rentals concentrating control, abandonment and migration, or poverty despite land ownership.

The implication: "Free market" without active state intervention preventing concentration naturally gravitates toward concentration. Markets don't produce equality—they amplify advantages. Those with capital, technology, and market access accumulate more. Those without cannot compete. Preventing concentration requires constant state intervention redistributing resources and opportunities. When state intervention ends (post-1940 in Mexico), concentration resumes.

Democratic Institutions Don't Prevent Concentration

Mexico has been democratic (by electoral standards) since 2000:

- Competitive elections with alternation of power
- Opposition parties can win
- Media operates freely (albeit concentrated in ownership)
- Civil society exists
- Freedom House rates Mexico "partly free"
- Elections are reasonably clean (some local fraud but not systemic)

Yet concentration persists or increases: Land Gini coefficient stable 0.76-0.78. Wealth Gini coefficient 0.80-0.83. Elite families maintain wealth. Poverty rates stable 43-46%. The democratic institutions don't translate to property redistribution.

Why democracy doesn't redistribute:

- Elite control campaign finance—progressive candidates depend on business donations
- Media shapes discourse favoring property protection
- Economic constraints limit policy options—capital flight threat
- Constitutional protections favor property rights
- Electoral democracy rewards consumption promises (flow) not redistribution (stock)
- Middle-class voters oppose redistribution threatening their modest property
- International system rewards "responsible" (property-respecting) governments

The synthesis: Electoral democracy enables competition over flow benefits distribution and policy priorities within narrow boundaries. But it doesn't enable stock transformation because elite power operates beyond electoral system. Democracy becomes mechanism for managing popular expectations while protecting property.

Legal Frameworks Enable Elite Adaptation

Mexican elite adapted to every regime change by capturing legal framework:

Colonial period (1521-1810): Spanish law granted conquistador property rights, established encomienda/hacienda systems, and created racial caste system fragmenting resistance.

Independence (1810-1821): New republican constitution protected existing property while eliminating Spanish Crown sovereignty.

Liberal Reform (1855-1876): Ley Lerdo forced church/indigenous communal land sales—elite purchased land "legally."

Porfiriato (1876-1910): Survey laws enabled appropriation of 50 million hectares "legally" through claims of "vacant" lands.

Revolution (1910-1940): Article 27 enabled redistribution but protected "small property" and private commercial agriculture.

Neoliberal era (1982-2000): Article 27 reform (1992) legalized reconcentration by removing ejido inalienability.

Contemporary (2000-2025): Constitutional property protections remain. Elite families operate within legal framework accumulating wealth through: inheritance, business profits, real estate appreciation, and financial investments.

The pattern: Elite capture legal system defining property rights favorably. When revolutionary transformation occurs (1910-1940), they accept losses temporarily while adapting to new framework. Then they use legal mechanisms (Article 27 reform 1992) to reverse redistribution. Law is tool for maintaining/reconstituting power—not neutral framework.

Elite Circulation Maintains Concentration

Mexican history shows extensive elite circulation—old families destroyed, new families rising. But concentration persists:

1521: Spanish conquistadors appropriate indigenous lands
1810: Creole elite replace Spanish peninsulares
1910: Revolutionary winners replace Porfirian oligarchs
1940-2000: PRI-connected elite emerge from revolutionary ranks
1980-2000: Neoliberal beneficiaries (Slim, etc.) acquire privatized assets
2000-present: Some elite families maintain wealth 100-200+ years, others are new

The critical insight: Concentration persists despite elite circulation. Different families owning property doesn't reduce concentration—it changes names on titles while maintaining structure. The Mexican Revolution destroyed specific oligarchs but not oligarchy—new elite formed from revolutionary winners maintaining similar concentration levels.

Why this matters: Focusing on individual elite ("Carlos Slim has too much wealth") misses structural issue. Expropriating Slim wouldn't end concentration—his wealth would transfer to others or new elite would emerge. The problem is property concentration enabling any elite to exist—not specific individuals composing elite currently.

The solution implication: Preventing concentration requires not just one-time redistribution but permanent legal frameworks preventing accumulation. This means wealth taxes preventing inter-generational transmission, limits on property ownership regardless of owner identity, worker ownership of enterprises, and constant redistribution as accumulation occurs. Without permanent mechanisms preventing concentration, it reconstitutes.

VIII. Final Synthesis: 500 Years, Zero Permanent Change

The Devastating Timeline

1521: Spanish conquest appropriates 100% indigenous lands. Property concentration established.

1810: Independence changes sovereignty. Property concentration: UNCHANGED (Creole elite replace Spanish).

1876: Liberal Reform and Porfiriato accelerate concentration to 90-95% (1-2% owning).

1910-1940: Mexican Revolution redistributes 47-50% to 3+ million families. **ONLY SUCCESSFUL REDISTRIBUTION IN 500 YEARS.**

1940-2020: Systematic reversal through PRI management, Article 27 reform, NAFTA integration.

2025: Concentration 60-70% controlled by 1-3%. Approaching 1910 levels.

The net change over 500 years: Property concentrated under Spanish colonialism → Property concentrated under contemporary capitalism. The specific mechanisms changed. The legal frameworks evolved. The ideological justifications shifted. The families owning property circulated partially. But concentration persisted.

What Every Mexican "Revolution" Accomplished

Political sovereignty: Achieved (Independence 1821)

Ideological transformation: Achieved repeatedly (Liberal secularism, Porfirian positivism, Revolutionary nationalism, Neoliberal market ideology, MORENA's Fourth Transformation)

Institutional change: Achieved repeatedly (Colonial → Republican → Dictatorship → PRI → Democracy)

Flow benefits: Achieved partially (wage improvements, social programs, infrastructure)

Property redistribution: Achieved temporarily (1910-1940), then reversed (1940-2020)

Permanent transformation: NOT ACHIEVED

Why Permanent Transformation Proved Impossible

The Mexican case demonstrates structural constraints:

Legal frameworks protect property through constitutional guarantees and international agreements.

Economic integration creates capital flight threats and dependency on foreign investment.

Elite power operates beyond electoral democracy through control of investment, media, and economic resources.

Market mechanisms favor concentration through economies of scale and capital accumulation.

Redistribution requires constant defense but revolutionary mobilization ends as generation dies.

International system rewards property protection and punishes expropriation.

Democratic left lacks revolutionary force necessary to overcome elite resistance.

The Flow vs. Stock Boundary

Every Mexican regime change operates within boundary:

ACCEPTABLE: Flow benefits (wages, transfers, social programs, infrastructure, regulatory reforms)

UNACCEPTABLE: Stock transformation (property redistribution, wealth expropriation, nationalization, inheritance restrictions)

Elite tolerate flow benefits because:

- They're affordable (2-5% GDP)
- They're reversible
- They increase consumption benefiting business
- They don't threaten property ownership

Elite unite against stock transformation because:

- It threatens fundamental interests
- It's irreversible (once property redistributed, harder to reconcentrate)
- It transforms power relations
- It enables further expropriation

This boundary defines "acceptable" reform. AMLO maximized acceptable reform. Going beyond requires force elite tolerate in revolutionary conditions (1910-1920) but not democratic conditions (2018-present).

The Ultimate Lesson

Mexico had genuine land reform that destroyed oligarchy and redistributed property to millions. It was reversed within three generations through legal mechanisms and market forces. If Mexico—with most successful Latin American land reform—cannot maintain redistribution, what does this teach about redistribution possibilities generally?

The implication: Redistributing property once proves insufficient. Concentration gravitates toward reconcentration through market mechanisms when:

- Legal frameworks permit accumulation

- Political mobilization maintaining redistribution ends
- Market integration makes small-scale production unviable
- Elite legal strategies exploit vulnerabilities
- International system pressures against property restrictions

Preventing permanent concentration requires: Not one-time redistribution but constant active prevention of accumulation through wealth taxes, property limits, inheritance restrictions, and worker ownership. This requires permanent political mobilization treating redistribution as ongoing process—not accomplished revolutionary goal.

Why this rarely happens: Sustaining mobilization across generations proves impossible. Revolutionary generation dies. Succeeding generations lack same commitment. Economic integration creates pressures toward concentration. Elite capture legal system enabling reversal. The Mexican pattern suggests concentration is structural tendency that temporary interruptions cannot permanently reverse.

What Makes This Collection's Approach Necessary

Understanding these patterns requires analyzing 200-500 year timeframes:

Short-term analysis misses pattern: Studying 2018-2024 AMLO period shows flow benefits improving living standards. Appears progressive. But 500-year view reveals pattern: revolutionary rhetoric, flow benefits, property protected—identical to Independence, Reform, Revolution.

Medium-term analysis misses reconcentration: Studying 1910-1940 shows successful redistribution. Appears transformative. But 100-year view reveals reversal: redistribution → PRI management → Salinas reform → reconcentration.

Long-term analysis reveals pattern: Only 200-500 year view shows concentration persisting across regime changes, ideological shifts, democratic transitions, and revolutionary transformations. Pattern visible only in centuries-long perspective.

Elite family tracking proves continuity: Following specific families (Slim, Azcárraga, Baillères) across generations demonstrates wealth transmission despite political upheaval. This makes abstract "elite power" concrete—showing how specific families maintain position.

Comparative analysis prevents nationalist explanations: Comparing Mexico to Argentina, Peru, and other cases prevents dismissing patterns as "uniquely Mexican." When same patterns appear across Latin America, structural explanations become necessary.

This is why the collection matters. Understanding elite power requires centuries-long analysis showing patterns invisible in shorter timeframes. Mexico provides definitive case: even successful revolutionary expropriation proves reversible, demonstrating elite power's structural resilience operates across generations despite temporary disruptions.

Conclusion: The Mexican Pattern and Global Implications

Mexico experienced: Spanish colonial genocide and property appropriation (1521-1810), independence preserving concentration (1821), liberal reform accelerating concentration (1855-1876), Porfirian extreme concentration (1876-1910), genuine revolutionary redistribution destroying oligarchy (1910-1940), and systematic reversal reconstituting concentration (1940-2025).

The result after 500 years: Property concentrated under Spanish colonialism → Property concentrated under contemporary capitalism. Names changed. Mechanisms adapted. Legal frameworks evolved. Ideological justifications shifted. But structure persisted.

This demonstrates elite power's fundamental resilience. Even revolutionary violence killing 1-2 million, destroying old oligarchy, and redistributing 47-50% of land proved insufficient for permanent transformation. Within three generations, concentration reconstituted through legal reforms and market mechanisms.

For understanding elite power globally, Mexico provides several critical lessons:

Lesson 1: Elite power operates beyond political regimes. Dictatorship, democracy, revolutionary transformation, market authoritarianism—all can serve concentration.

Lesson 2: Revolutionary expropriation can be reversed. Redistribution requires permanent defense or reconcentration occurs.

Lesson 3: Flow benefits cannot substitute for stock transformation. Consumption improvements don't change power relations.

Lesson 4: Market mechanisms favor concentration. "Free markets" naturally reconcentrate property.

Lesson 5: Democratic institutions don't prevent concentration. Electoral competition operates within boundaries protecting property.

Lesson 6: Legal frameworks enable elite adaptation. Elites capture law defining property rights favorably.

Lesson 7: Elite circulation maintains concentration. New families replacing old families doesn't reduce concentration.

Lesson 8: Permanent transformation requires permanent mobilization. One-time redistribution proves insufficient.

These lessons emerge only from centuries-long analysis tracking property structures across regime changes. The Mexican case—with most successful Latin American land reform that was subsequently reversed—proves elite power's structural resilience operates across generations despite revolutionary disruptions.

When even Mexico's genuine revolutionary transformation proves reversible, the pattern's durability becomes undeniable. Elite power adapts to every challenge, survives every "revolution," and reconstitutes after every disruption. Understanding this pattern requires the collection's long-term comparative approach. Mexico demonstrates definitively: 500 years of revolutionary rhetoric produced zero permanent redistribution—proving elite power operates beyond political theater.

[END OF PART 5 of 5]

[COMPLETE: MEXICO CASE STUDY]

This concludes the five-part case study "Mexico: Three Centuries of Revolutionary Rhetoric and Elite Continuity (1521-2025)," documenting how property concentration established during Spanish colonial conquest persisted through independence, liberal reform, Porfirian dictatorship, revolutionary redistribution, PRI authoritarianism, democratic transition, and leftist populism—demonstrating elite power's structural resilience across 500 years of political transformation.

MEXICO CASE STUDY: THEMATIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Three Centuries of Revolutionary Rhetoric and Elite Continuity (1521-2025)"

I. COLONIAL FOUNDATIONS AND PROPERTY APPROPRIATION (1519-1810)

Conquest and Encomienda System

Lockhart, James. *The Nahuas After the Conquest: A Social and Cultural History of the Indians of Central Mexico, Sixteenth Through Eighteenth Centuries*. Stanford University Press, 1992.

Gibson, Charles. *The Aztecs Under Spanish Rule: A History of the Indians of the Valley of Mexico, 1519-1810*. Stanford University Press, 1964.

Simpson, Lesley Byrd. *The Encomienda in New Spain: The Beginning of Spanish Mexico*. University of California Press, 1950.

Borah, Woodrow, and Sherburne F. Cook. *The Aboriginal Population of Central Mexico on the Eve of the Spanish Conquest*. University of California Press, 1963.

Hacienda System Development

Chevalier, François. *Land and Society in Colonial Mexico: The Great Hacienda*. University of California Press, 1963.

Van Young, Eric. *Hacienda and Market in Eighteenth-Century Mexico: The Rural Economy of the Guadalajara Region, 1675-1820*. University of California Press, 1981.

Brading, David A. *Haciendas and Ranchos in the Mexican Bajío: León 1700-1860*. Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Indigenous Dispossession

Melville, Elinor G. K. *A Plague of Sheep: Environmental Consequences of the Conquest of Mexico*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Taylor, William B. *Landlord and Peasant in Colonial Oaxaca*. Stanford University Press, 1972.

Haskett, Robert. *Indigenous Rulers: An Ethnohistory of Town Government in Colonial Cuernavaca*. University of New Mexico Press, 1991.

Church Landholding

Lavrin, Asunción. "The Role of the Nunneries in the Economy of New Spain in the Eighteenth Century." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 46, no. 4 (1966): 371-393.

Brading, David A. *Church and State in Bourbon Mexico: The Diocese of Michoacán 1749-1810*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Late Colonial Economy

Coatsworth, John H. "The Limits of Colonial Absolutism: The State in Eighteenth-Century Mexico." In *Essays in the Political, Economic and Social History of Colonial Latin America*, edited by Karen Spalding, 25-51. University of Delaware Press, 1982.

Van Young, Eric. *The Other Rebellion: Popular Violence, Ideology, and the Mexican Struggle for Independence, 1810-1821*. Stanford University Press, 2001.

II. INDEPENDENCE AND LIBERAL REFORM (1810-1876)

Independence Movement

Hamnett, Brian R. *Roots of Insurgency: Mexican Regions, 1750-1824*. Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Rodríguez O., Jaime E. *The Independence of Spanish America*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Anna, Timothy E. *The Fall of the Royal Government in Mexico City*. University of Nebraska Press, 1978.

Early National Period and Property

Bazant, Jan. *Alienation of Church Wealth in Mexico: Social and Economic Aspects of the Liberal Revolution, 1856-1875*. Cambridge University Press, 1971.

Fraser, Donald J. "La Política de Desamortización en las Comunidades Indígenas, 1856-1872." *Historia Mexicana* 21, no. 4 (1972): 615-652.

Knowlton, Robert J. *Church Property and the Mexican Reform, 1856-1910*. Northern Illinois University Press, 1976.

Liberal Reform Era

Powell, T. G. *El Liberalismo y el Campesinado en el Centro de México (1850 a 1876)*. SepSetentas, 1974.

Sinkin, Richard N. *The Mexican Reform, 1855-1876: A Study in Liberal Nation-Building*. University of Texas Press, 1979.

Berry, Charles R. *The Reform in Oaxaca, 1856-76: A Microhistory of the Liberal Revolution*. University of Nebraska Press, 1981.

Indigenous Land Loss

Guardino, Peter. *Peasants, Politics, and the Formation of Mexico's National State: Guerrero, 1800-1857*. Stanford University Press, 1996.

Thomson, Guy P. C. *Patriotism, Politics, and Popular Liberalism in Nineteenth-Century Mexico: Juan Francisco Lucas and the Puebla Sierra*. Scholarly Resources, 1999.

III. PORFIRIATO AND EXTREME CONCENTRATION (1876-1910)

Land Concentration Mechanisms

Holden, Robert H. *Mexico and the Survey of Public Lands: The Management of Modernization, 1876-1911*. Northern Illinois University Press, 1994.

Knowlton, Robert J. "La Individualización de la Propiedad Corporativa Civil en el Siglo XIX: Notas Sobre Jalisco." *Historia Mexicana* 28, no. 1 (1978): 24-61.

Katz, Friedrich. *The Life and Times of Pancho Villa*. Stanford University Press, 1998. [Sections on Porfirian land concentration in Chihuahua]

Porfirian Political Economy

Haber, Stephen H. *Industry and Underdevelopment: The Industrialization of Mexico, 1890-1940*. Stanford University Press, 1989.

Coatsworth, John H. *Growth Against Development: The Economic Impact of Railroads in Porfirian Mexico*. Northern Illinois University Press, 1981.

Wasserman, Mark. *Capitalists, Caciques, and Revolution: The Native Elite and Foreign Enterprise in Chihuahua, Mexico, 1854-1911*. University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

Rural Conditions and Resistance

Katz, Friedrich, ed. *Riot, Rebellion, and Revolution: Rural Social Conflict in Mexico*. Princeton University Press, 1988.

Tutino, John. *From Insurrection to Revolution in Mexico: Social Bases of Agrarian Violence, 1750-1940*. Princeton University Press, 1986.

Joseph, Gilbert M., and Daniel Nugent, eds. *Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern Mexico*. Duke University Press, 1994.

Specific Regional Studies

Wells, Allen, and Gilbert M. Joseph. *Summer of Discontent, Seasons of Upheaval: Elite Politics and Rural Insurgency in Yucatán, 1876-1915*. Stanford University Press, 1996.

Womack, John Jr. *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution*. Vintage Books, 1968. [Background on Morelos hacienda expansion]

IV. MEXICAN REVOLUTION AND LAND REFORM (1910-1940)

Revolutionary Origins

Hart, John M. *Revolutionary Mexico: The Coming and Process of the Mexican Revolution*. University of California Press, 1987.

Knight, Alan. *The Mexican Revolution*, 2 vols. Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Katz, Friedrich. *The Secret War in Mexico: Europe, the United States, and the Mexican Revolution*. University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Zapatista Movement

Womack, John Jr. *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution*. Vintage Books, 1968.

Warman, Arturo. *We Come to Object: The Peasants of Morelos and the National State*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.

Brunk, Samuel. *Emiliano Zapata: Revolution and Betrayal in Mexico*. University of New Mexico Press, 1995.

Villa and Northern Revolution

Katz, Friedrich. *The Life and Times of Pancho Villa*. Stanford University Press, 1998.

Nugent, Daniel. *Spent Cartridges of Revolution: An Anthropological History of Namiquipa, Chihuahua*. University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Constitutional Framework

Niemeyer, E. V. Jr. *Revolution at Querétaro: The Mexican Constitutional Convention of 1916-1917*. University of Texas Press, 1974.

Land Reform Implementation

Simpson, Eyler N. *The Ejido: Mexico's Way Out*. University of North Carolina Press, 1937.

Tannenbaum, Frank. *The Mexican Agrarian Revolution*. Macmillan, 1929.

Senior, Clarence. *Land Reform and Democracy*. University of Florida Press, 1958.

Cárdenas Era

Hamilton, Nora. *The Limits of State Autonomy: Post-Revolutionary Mexico*. Princeton University Press, 1982.

Becker, Marjorie. *Setting the Virgin on Fire: Lázaro Cárdenas, Michoacán Peasants, and the Redemption of the Mexican Revolution*. University of California Press, 1995.

Bantjes, Adrian A. *As If Jesus Walked on Earth: Cardenismo, Sonora, and the Mexican Revolution*. Scholarly Resources, 1998.

V. PRI ERA AND EJIDO SYSTEM (1940-1982)

PRI Consolidation

Wilkie, James W. *The Mexican Revolution: Federal Expenditure and Social Change Since 1910*. University of California Press, 1967.

Camp, Roderic Ai. *Mexican Political Biographies, 1935-1993*. University of Texas Press, 1995.

Needler, Martin C. *Politics and Society in Mexico*. University of New Mexico Press, 1971.

Ejido Economics and Decline

Sanderson, Steven E. *Agrarian Populism and the Mexican State: The Struggle for Land in Sonora*. University of California Press, 1981.

Hewitt de Alcántara, Cynthia. *Modernizing Mexican Agriculture: Socioeconomic Implications of Technological Change, 1940-1970*. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, 1976.

DeWalt, Billie R., and Martha W. Rees. *The End of Agrarian Reform in Mexico: Past Lessons, Future Prospects*. Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego, 1994.

Green Revolution and Agriculture

Yates, P. Lamartine. *Mexico's Agricultural Dilemma*. University of Arizona Press, 1981.

Hewitt de Alcántara, Cynthia. "The 'Green Revolution' as History: The Mexican Experience." *Development and Change* 5, no. 2 (1973-1974): 25-44.

Rural Political Control

Rus, Jan. "The 'Comunidad Revolucionaria Institucional': The Subversion of Native Government in Highland Chiapas, 1936-1968." In *Everyday Forms of State Formation*, edited by Gilbert M. Joseph and Daniel Nugent, 265-300. Duke University Press, 1994.

Craig, Ann L. *The First Agraristas: An Oral History of a Mexican Agrarian Reform Movement*. University of California Press, 1983.

Import Substitution Industrialization

Brothers, Dwight S., and Leopoldo Solís. *Mexican Financial Development*. University of Texas Press, 1966.

Reynolds, Clark W. *The Mexican Economy: Twentieth-Century Structure and Growth*. Yale University Press, 1970.

VI. NEOLIBERAL ERA AND RECONCENTRATION (1982-2000)

Economic Crisis and Reform

Maxfield, Sylvia. *Governing Capital: International Finance and Mexican Politics*. Cornell University Press, 1990.

Pastor, Manuel Jr., and Carol Wise. "The Origins and Sustainability of Mexico's Free Trade Policy." *International Organization* 48, no. 3 (1994): 459-489.

Teichman, Judith A. *Privatization and Political Change in Mexico*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995.

Article 27 Reform

Cornelius, Wayne A., and David Myhre, eds. *The Transformation of Rural Mexico: Reforming the Ejido Sector*. Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego, 1998.

DeWalt, Billie R., Martha W. Rees, and Arthur D. Murphy. *The End of Agrarian Reform in Mexico: Past Lessons, Future Prospects*. Transformation of Rural Mexico Series, No. 3. Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, 1994.

Zepeda, Eduardo, Timothy A. Wise, and Kevin P. Gallagher. "Rethinking Trade Policy for Development: Lessons from Mexico under NAFTA." Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Policy Outlook, December 2009.

NAFTA and Agricultural Impact

Nadal, Alejandro. *The Environmental and Social Impacts of Economic Liberalization on Corn Production in Mexico*. Oxfam GB and WWF International, 2000.

Audley, John J., et al. *NAFTA's Promise and Reality: Lessons from Mexico for the Hemisphere*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2004.

Wise, Timothy A. "Agricultural Dumping Under NAFTA: Estimating the Costs of U.S. Agricultural Policies to Mexican Producers." Mexican Rural Development Research Reports, Report 7. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 2009.

Salinas Era

Centeno, Miguel Angel. *Democracy Within Reason: Technocratic Revolution in Mexico*. Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994.

Dresser, Denise. *Neopopulist Solutions to Neoliberal Problems: Mexico's National Solidarity Program*. Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego, 1991.

Privatization

Rogozinski, Jacques. *High Price for Change: Privatization in Mexico*. Inter-American Development Bank, 1998.

Teichman, Judith A. "Privatization and the State: Neoliberalism's Transformation of Mexico's Politics." *Política y Gobierno* 4, no. 1 (1997): 89-117.

VII. DEMOCRATIC TRANSITION ERA (2000-2018)

PAN Governments

Levy, Daniel C., and Kathleen Bruhn. *Mexico: The Struggle for Democratic Development*. University of California Press, 2006.

Middlebrook, Kevin J., ed. *Dilemmas of Political Change in Mexico*. Institute of Latin American Studies, University of London, 2004.

Drug War and Violence

Ríos, Viridiana, and David A. Shirk. "Drug Violence in Mexico: Data and Analysis Through 2010." Special Report, Trans-Border Institute, Joan B. Kroc School of Peace Studies, University of San Diego, February 2011.

Guerrero-Gutiérrez, Eduardo. "Security, Drugs, and Violence in Mexico: A Survey." 7th North American Forum, Washington DC, 2011.

Osorio, Javier. "The Contagion of Drug Violence: Spatiotemporal Dynamics of the Mexican War on Drugs." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59, no. 8 (2015): 1403-1432.

Heinle, Kimberly, Octavio Rodríguez Ferreira, and David A. Shirk. "Drug Violence in Mexico: Data and Analysis Through 2016." Special Report, Justice in Mexico, University of San Diego, April 2017.

Rural Violence and Land Conflicts

Paley, Dawn. *Drug War Capitalism*. AK Press, 2014.

Human Rights Watch. *Neither Rights Nor Security: Killings, Torture, and Disappearances in Mexico's "War on Drugs"*. November 2011.

Mercille, Julien. "The Media-Entertainment Industry and the 'War on Drugs' in Mexico." *Latin American Perspectives* 41, no. 2 (2014): 110-129.

Peña Nieto Era

Ai Camp, Roderic. *Politics in Mexico: Democratic Consolidation or Decline?* Oxford University Press, 2016.

Ayotzinapa Case

Interdisciplinary Group of Independent Experts (GIEI). *Ayotzinapa Report: Research and Initial Conclusions of the Disappearances and Homicides of the Normalistas from Ayotzinapa*. September 2015.

Gibler, John. *I Couldn't Even Imagine That They Would Kill Us: An Oral History of the Attacks Against the Students of Ayotzinapa*. City Lights Publishers, 2017.

VIII. MORENA ERA AND FOURTH TRANSFORMATION (2018-2025)

AMLO's Rise and Presidency

Dresser, Denise. "Mexico: The Perils of Fragmentation." *Journal of Democracy* 30, no. 4 (2019): 35-48.

Watt, Peter, and Roberto Zepeda. *Drug War Mexico: Politics, Neoliberalism and Violence in the New Narcoeconomy*. Zed Books, 2012.

Shirk, David A., and Duncan Wood, eds. *The Changing Landscape of Mexican Security*. Mexico Institute, Wilson Center, 2019.

Social Programs and Redistribution

Levy, Santiago, and Norbert Schady. "Latin America's Social Policy Challenge: Education, Social Insurance, Redistribution." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 27, no. 2 (2013): 193-218.

Parker, Susan W., and Tom Vogl. "Do Conditional Cash Transfers Improve Economic Outcomes in the Next Generation? Evidence from Mexico." NBER Working Paper No. 24303, February 2018.

Continuity of Neoliberal Structures

Babb, Sarah. "The Washington Consensus as Transnational Policy Paradigm: Its Origins, Trajectory and Likely Successor." *Review of International Political Economy* 20, no. 2 (2013): 268-297.

IX. ELITE FAMILIES AND WEALTH CONCENTRATION

Contemporary Elite

Haber, Stephen, ed. *Crony Capitalism and Economic Growth in Latin America: Theory and Evidence*. Hoover Institution Press, 2002.

Haber, Stephen, Herbert S. Klein, Noel Maurer, and Kevin J. Middlebrook. *Mexico Since 1980*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Camp, Roderic Ai. *Mexico's Mandarins: Crafting a Power Elite for the Twenty-First Century*. University of California Press, 2002.

Carlos Slim and Telecommunications

Telésforo, Guerrero-García. "Carlos Slim: Impacto en los Mercados de Telecomunicaciones Mexicano y Latinoamericano." *El Cotidiano* 161 (May-June 2010): 53-62.

Mariscal, Judith, and Eugenio Rivera. "Regulación y Competencia en las Telecomunicaciones Mexicanas." Serie Estudios y Perspectivas No. 83, CEPAL, Mexico, 2007.

Wealth and Income Inequality

Esquivel, Gerardo. *Desigualdad Extrema en México: Concentración del Poder Económico y Político*. Oxfam México, 2015.

Campos-Vázquez, Raymundo M., Gerardo Esquivel, and Nora Lustig. "The Rise and Fall of Income Inequality in Mexico, 1989-2010." In *Falling Inequality in Latin America: Policy Changes and Lessons*, edited by Giovanni Andrea Cornia, 140-163. Oxford University Press, 2014.

López-Calva, Luis F., and Nora Lustig, eds. *Declining Inequality in Latin America: A Decade of Progress?* Brookings Institution Press, 2010.

Land Concentration Statistics

World Bank. "Agriculture and Rural Development: Mexico." Various years.

OECD. *OECD Review of Agricultural Policies: Mexico 2007*. OECD Publishing, 2007.

FAO. "Agricultural Land Distribution and Land Tenure in Mexico." Country Report, Various years.

X. STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Property Rights and Political Economy

North, Douglass C. *Structure and Change in Economic History*. W.W. Norton, 1981.

Acemoglu, Daron, and James A. Robinson. *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Sokoloff, Kenneth L., and Stanley L. Engerman. "History Lessons: Institutions, Factor Endowments, and Paths of Development in the New World." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14, no. 3 (2000): 217-232.

State Formation and Elite Power

Tilly, Charles. *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1990*. Basil Blackwell, 1990.

Mann, Michael. *The Sources of Social Power*, Vol. 2: *The Rise of Classes and Nation-States, 1760-1914*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Revolution and Redistribution

Skocpol, Theda. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Paige, Jeffery M. *Agrarian Revolution: Social Movements and Export Agriculture in the Underdeveloped World*. Free Press, 1975.

Moore, Barrington Jr. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Beacon Press, 1966.

Latin American Political Economy

Cardoso, Fernando Henrique, and Enzo Faletto. *Dependency and Development in Latin America*. University of California Press, 1979.

Collier, Ruth Berins, and David Collier. *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America*. Princeton University Press, 1991.

Neoliberalism and Structural Adjustment

Harvey, David. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press, 2005.

Williamson, John. "What Washington Means by Policy Reform." In *Latin American Adjustment: How Much Has Happened?* edited by John Williamson, 7-20. Institute for International Economics, 1990.

Reconcentration Mechanisms

Borras, Saturnino M. Jr., and Jennifer C. Franco. "Contemporary Discourses and Contestations around Pro-Poor Land Policies and Land Governance." *Journal of Agrarian Change* 10, no. 1 (2010): 1-32.

Deininger, Klaus, and Derek Byerlee. *Rising Global Interest in Farmland: Can It Yield Sustainable and Equitable Benefits?* World Bank Publications, 2011.

XI. COMPARATIVE LATIN AMERICAN CONTEXT

Regional Land Reform Studies

Kay, Cristóbal. "Latin America's Agrarian Reform: Lights and Shadows." Land Research Action Network, 2001.

Thiesenhusen, William C., ed. *Searching for Agrarian Reform in Latin America*. Unwin Hyman, 1989.

Prosterman, Roy L., and Jeffrey M. Riedinger. *Land Reform and Democratic Development*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

Comparative Revolutionary Outcomes

Wickham-Crowley, Timothy P. *Guerrillas and Revolution in Latin America: A Comparative Study of Insurgents and Regimes Since 1956*. Princeton University Press, 1992.

Foran, John, ed. *Theorizing Revolutions*. Routledge, 1997.

Regional Inequality Patterns

World Bank. *Inequality in Latin America: Breaking with History?* World Bank Latin American and Caribbean Studies, 2004.

ECLAC (Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean). *Social Panorama of Latin America*. Annual publications.

XII. PRIMARY SOURCES AND STATISTICAL DATA

Mexican Government Sources

INEGI (Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía). Agricultural Census data, 1930-2020.

INEGI. National Survey of Household Income and Expenditure (ENIGH), Various years.

CONEVAL (Consejo Nacional de Evaluación de la Política de Desarrollo Social). Poverty statistics and social program evaluations, 2008-2024.

Secretaría de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural. Agricultural production and land tenure statistics.

International Organizations

World Bank. World Development Indicators. Various years.

FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization). FAOSTAT database on agricultural land distribution.

OECD. Economic Surveys: Mexico. Various years.

UNDP. Human Development Reports: Mexico. Various years.

Historical Documents

Constitución Política de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos (1917, with amendments).

Plan de Ayala (1911) - Zapatista revolutionary platform.

Ley Lerdo (1856) - Liberal Reform legislation.

Mexican Census data, 1895-2020.

Contemporary Journalism and Investigation

Proceso (magazine). Various investigations on elite wealth, violence, and politics.

La Jornada. Coverage of social movements and agrarian issues.

Reforma and El Universal. Economic and political coverage.

XIII. THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO COLLECTION FRAMEWORK

Flow vs. Stock Distinction

Piketty, Thomas. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Harvard University Press, 2014.

Atkinson, Anthony B. *Inequality: What Can Be Done?* Harvard University Press, 2015.

Elite Power Continuity

Mills, C. Wright. *The Power Elite*. Oxford University Press, 1956.

Domhoff, G. William. *Who Rules America? The Triumph of the Corporate Rich*. McGraw-Hill, 2014.

Long-Duration Analysis

Braudel, Fernand. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*. University of California Press, 1995 [1949].

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Modern World-System*, 4 vols. Academic Press/University of California Press, 1974-2011.

Property and Power

Marx, Karl. *Capital*, Vol. 1. Various editions [1867].

Polanyi, Karl. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Beacon Press, 2001 [1944].

METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

This bibliography emphasizes works that:

1. **Provide quantitative data** on property concentration, wealth distribution, and poverty across different Mexican eras

2. **Track long-term structural patterns** rather than focusing solely on single administrations or short periods

3. **Analyze mechanisms of appropriation and reconcentration** showing how elite power adapts across regime changes

4. **Document resistance and revolutionary mobilization** to understand why redistribution occurred 1910-1940 but not in other periods

5. **Compare Mexican patterns to regional/global contexts** demonstrating this is not uniquely Mexican but reflects broader patterns of elite power

The collection's framework requires centuries-long analysis showing property concentration persists across political transformations. This bibliography provides sources enabling that analysis—from colonial land grants through contemporary billionaire wealth, demonstrating 500 years of revolutionary rhetoric produced zero permanent redistribution.

[END BIBLIOGRAPHY]

Copyright and Licensing

© 2025 Thomas J. Bryan

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.
To view a copy of this license, visit: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

You are free to:
- Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format
- Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material

Under the following terms:
- Attribution — You must give appropriate credit
- NonCommercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes

This case study is part of the collection *Patterns of Power: Systematic Analysis of Elite Control Mechanisms Across Civilizations*